

THE  
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

NO. 4.—OCTOBER, 1886.

---

I.

THE OBJECTIVE IN CHRISTIANITY.

BY PROF. THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE old war waged in the Middle Ages between the Realists and Nominalists was not, by any means, a mere battle of words. It involved principles that are highly essential to a right understanding of our human life, and also of Christianity. As between Abelard and Roscellinus, indeed, it was made to apply chiefly to the one doctrine of the holy Trinity. That doctrine had been stated and held by the Church as involving three persons in one essence. If, now, *universals* are mere empty names, *afflatus vocis*, and individuals, or single things, are the only real existences, as Roscellinus maintained, then the word *essence*, as applied to the doctrine of the Trinity, was a mere empty sound, and the only reality consisted in the three persons, and this involved, as Anselm held, the doctrine of three Gods, tri-theism. This was plain at once, and accordingly the teaching of Roscellinus was condemned. The divine essence is as real as the three persons; otherwise the unity of the Godhead is a mere fiction.

But there was danger on the other side also in pressing the philosophical doctrine of extreme realism, according to which universals are regarded as before, and independent of, individuals, *universalia ante rem*, for in that view the divine essence may be conceived of as a fourth entity in the Godhead, so that we would then have the three persons *plus* the divine essence. The right solution of this difficulty is supplied by the formula of moderate realism, *universalia in re*, according to which the divine essence must be regarded as existing in the three persons in such sense that it has no existence apart from them. So far as the philosophical aspect of the doctrine is concerned, it is much the same as the question in regard to the relation between the substance and the attributes in any existence. Here, too, it has been made a question whether such a thing as the substance has any existence apart from the attributes. If, for example, all its attributes are abstracted from an orange, is there anything remaining that we can designate as the substance? Is not the orange simply a combination of attributes, and its substance a mere imaginary quantity?

This purely philosophical question determines the doctrine of transsubstantiation in Roman Catholic theology. According to that doctrine, the natural substance of the bread in the holy Eucharist is removed in the act of consecration, whilst the attributes remain, and the real substance of our Lord's body is substituted in the place of the natural substance. Hence whilst the taste, smell, touch, etc.,—all the attributes of natural bread—remain, the real, inner, invisible substance is the veritable body of Christ. We have an instance here, therefore, in which a doctrine of the Church, and that doctrine infallible, as it is claimed, is made to depend on the truth of a purely metaphysical problem. That the body of our Lord is present, in some mysterious way, in the holy Eucharist, is taught in the Word of God, and must be accepted; but the Roman Church has gone further, and defined the manner according to which it is present, and thus produced not only what all Protestant theology holds to be an error, but it has staked the truth of its doc-

trine on a purely metaphysical distinction, which may, or may not, be true. We do not raise a question now as to the truth or untruth of this metaphysical distinction.

But this war between realism and nominalism has back of it principles that relate not merely to single doctrines in theology, but that have to do with our conception of Christianity itself as a whole. We introduce the word OBJECTIVE here in order to indicate what we mean by realism as applied to Christianity. But before we proceed to discuss the objective character of Christianity, which, it will be found, we think, touches every vital doctrine of our holy religion, we shall first give some further attention to the metaphysical problem to which we have referred.

It is coming to be held very generally, we believe, by the best metaphysicians of the present day, that the doctrine of *conceptualism* has settled the old controversy between realism and nominalism. This doctrine holds that universals are, indeed, real, but only in the form of the subjective conception. If, for example, I use the word *man*, as in the proposition: 'Man is a fallen creature,' the question is whether there is any objective entity corresponding to this term. Realism answers in the affirmative, yet finds it difficult to point out this objective entity. Nominalism answers in the negative, and says that the word is a mere empty sound; that it is only a term used for the sake of convenience, and has no object corresponding to it, just as when we use the word *instrument*, we mean, not a hoe, an axe, a plough, nor any one particular instrument; but, for the sake of convenience, we use it as a name that may be applied to all instruments, a mere class name. Conceptualism says yes and no. It says that the word *man* has no objective entity corresponding to it, and yet as words are never empty, owing to the organic relation between thought and language, the word has a corresponding object; but that object is a concept, and therefore exists only in the mind. This, we believe, is the view of Bowne in this country, of Lotze in Germany, and metaphysicians generally on both sides of the Atlantic.\*

\* It is some time since we looked into Bowne's "Metaphysics: A Study

It may be owing to some obtuseness on our part, but we have not been able to surrender so entirely the claims of realism. We can easily see how it is that some universals, or generalities, are mere abstractions. The word instrument, for example, is an abstract term that has no objective entity corresponding to it, though it has an existence as a concept in the mind. So the words hardness, brittleness, etc., are abstractions merely. But there is a class of universals, designating what is generic or organic, that are *concrete* generalities, and these, we think, have objective entities corresponding to them. The term man, or its equivalents, mankind, humanity, is an example of this kind. When it is said, 'Man is mortal,' 'Man is a fallen creature,' the word man designates an objective reality; it is equivalent to human nature, and designates a generic life that exists in all men. There is a generic life and there is an individual life in mankind. Adam was not only an individual man, who lived and died, and in this character ceased to exist on earth, but he was also the generic head of the race, and in this character he continues to exist in all his

in First Principles," and we have not sufficiently examined Lotze's *Metaphysic*, a translation of which by Bernard Bosanquet, M.A., Fellow of University College, Oxford, has recently appeared from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, to speak with certainty on this point. Bowne is a pupil and disciple of Lotze. Both are far enough removed from materialism; but on the subject of realism, as applied to organic existences, if we understand one or both, we cannot bring our mind fully to accept their views. Both seem to us to deny substantiality to secondary causes or principles, and both explain all activity by what they call the *mechanical* theory, making no distinction substantially between a mechanism and an organism. Bowne somewhere says that the *potentiality* in a living germ is not a reality, but only our conception of the mode of action of the germ. Yet both clearly deny that a natural organism, or vitality in nature, is a product of matter. The principle of activity in a germ is an act of God, or His mode of producing activity; but this apparent denial of secondary causes is nearer to pantheism, we think, than the view which regards vitality as, in itself, a real force or cause of activity. We hold to the broad distinction between a mechanism and an organism. Perhaps a further examination of these writers may lead us to see that our difference from them is rather in the use of words than in reality.



descendants. As we understand him, Bowne maintains that humanity signifies merely the collection of individual men. He denies the existence, for instance, of what we call a potentiality in a seed. The acorn does not contain the oak tree in potentiality. All we have is only the fact that all acorns produce oak trees when the proper conditions are at hand, and what we speak of as a generic life, or uniform law, is only a manner of acting on the part of all acorns, and such manner of action or method is merely a thought of our minds in noting this activity.

Perhaps our difference here may rest in part on a mere different use of words, but to our mind it seems clear that there is something, an objective reality, in the acorn that acts as a law, causing it to produce an oak tree. This law exists in all acorns, so that however they may differ individually, yet there is that in them all that is alike, or identical, and this constitutes their genus or generic life. If an architect causes different buildings to be erected, differing in certain aspects yet having some general plan in them all, we trace this resemblance to the plan or design in the mind of the architect; so we trace the similarity in organic existences in the vegetable or animal kingdom to some law which determines the species. This is as real as the law which determines their individual peculiarities.

Surely there is something different here from what we have when we use the word instrument. It may indeed be said that there is a certain quality that is present in all instruments that constitutes them a class, but to our mind this is a very different thing from the common nature that constitutes all men *human*. Hence we distinguish humanity as a concrete generality (from *concreescere*, to flow together, because the generic and the individual life flow together in every human being) from instrument as an abstract generality.

Humanity is a spiritual unity containing within itself potentially all that is evolved in its development in the way of race, nationality, etc., etc. The state, for example, is not the result of human choice or plan, but it is involved in the original idea of humanity. There are two sides here to human existence, an

objective and a subjective. The life of every individual man stands in the objective life of the race. This real life is the background out of which his individuality is developed. One of the problems of his existence consists in moulding this general race life, which is in all alike, according to his original personality, under the direction of his will. In some the personality has a capacity to express the general and universal more than in others, and this gives the world *geniuses*, race-men, from *genus*, race or kind. Thus, for example, Shakspeare could speak for all men as from the very heart of humanity, for ancient and modern, cultured and uncultured, rich and poor, king and beggar, man and woman. And as a testimony of their sense of this race-life in them, to a greater or less degree, all men say of Shakspeare, "he speaks for me. What is deep down in the depths of my life here finds utterance."

No one, it seems to me, can study or understand man aright who has not some conception of these two sides of his life. Individual mind must be studied in the light of universal mind, individual will in the light of universal will or law. This, indeed, is the meaning of law in its universality, without which particular laws have no binding force. Truth, as universal reason, has binding force for particular mind. Hence my intelligence must bow to it. So the moral law is binding on my will, and I must do it reverence. This, of course, is leading us somewhat beyond our immediate problem, the relation of the individual life to the race life, and takes in a still broader generalization, viz., the relation of humanity as a whole to universal spiritual existence in God. But this is one of the points we wish to take in on our own way to our subject.

Humanity in its development in the sphere of time and space, in the order of the natural, phenomenal world, is joined with an invisible spiritual world that is eternal. The spiritual world underlies and supports the natural world at all points. Though man himself is finite, the infinite flows into and

through him. Though he lives in time the eternal sounds through him. Humanity as a whole is intoned from this spiritual realm, and every individual human life strikes its roots within the same. In various ways a sense of this relationship on the part of man to a spiritual realm that stands in the sphere of the absolute reveals itself in his consciousness and in his unfolding life. Every line of thought which his intelligence pursues leads off into the infinite and absolute. It is not only in pure metaphysics that this question in regard to the absolute is raised, it overshadows every science. Even mathematics, the most exact of all sciences, dealing with definite dimensions and quantities in space, yet has its infinite series and its mysteries in calculus that enter the border land of metaphysics. In the moral sphere, where we have to do with will and law, still more palpably do we find the lines reaching off into a realm that lies beyond the finite. A moral law that is absolutely binding, which the conscience acknowledges as such, must itself stand in the sphere of the absolute, and postulate a lawgiver who is infinite and eternal. And then in ways that reach deeper than conscious intelligence and will the spirit of man feels and realizes this eternal back-ground of his existence.

For it must be conceded that there are depths in the human soul that consciousness in its ordinary exercise does not penetrate. Consequently there is more in the life of man than he himself knows—than he can bring into forms of conscious thought. In proof of this we need only refer to the religious history of mankind. The fact that in all stages of civilization and culture mankind has always worshipped a deity shows that he has a sense of the divine even where he cannot formulate it in intellectual doctrine. Worship itself implies a sense of God, for without this it could not originate. The barbarian and the savage in his debasement still gives some expression to an homage that he does not understand. It may take vague and absurd forms, according to the degree in which he has wilfully obscured the knowledge of God originally committed to him, until it becomes a blind idolatry, a worshipping of the creature

instead of the Creator, yet this very perversion and caricature of worship is a testimony to its truth. Thus it is that man's religious nature testifies more deeply than his intellectual or moral nature to the infinite and absolute that intones his deepest life—to the existence of God. We do not mean by this, of course, that his religious nature holds only in the sphere of sub-conscious life, but that where this religious nature finds no true development in the true knowledge of God, it still reveals a darkened sense of the infinite; and further, that even where this development takes place the religious nature always carries in itself a feeling of the absolute that is deeper than conscious thought. Only God Himself, who knoweth our thoughts *afar off*, i. e., in their sub-conscious source in the human spirit, can look down into the deepest depths of that spirit.

Now just as human life is of this two-fold character, so Christianity is both objective and subjective, general and individual. It is a life in its individual subjects, constituting each one of its subjects a new creature, but it is also a general constitution in which each one stands as a constituent or member. This character of Christianity is fully set forth in the New Testament in its teaching respecting the Church as the body of Christ. There are different views as to what the Church is, whether it is the visible organization of professing Christians, as held by the Roman Catholics, or the body of true believers only, as held by Protestants, but as to its constitution the teaching referred to leaves no room for doubt. It is an organism, and as such pervaded by a common life. It is joined with Christ as the natural human body is joined to its head. It constitutes the beginning of a new creation, which will eventuate in "the new heavens and the new earth." Hence Christ is called by St. Paul the last Adam, the head of a new race. The first Adam was of the earth, earthy. He was the head of the natural human race which fell in his fall. The last Adam is from heaven, a spiritual man, the Son of Man, and he became the head of a new spiritual order. That

which was first was natural, and that which was last was spiritual.

One great problem, *the* great problem, of every man's life, if properly understood, consists in rising from the natural state in which he is born into a spiritual manhood. A new birth is an innate necessity for man. Just as physical birth must be followed by an awakening and unfolding of the intellectual and moral nature, an incubation that goes on in the bosom of family life after physical birth, before a child can realize its life relation to its parents, so man's natural state in general requires to be lifted into the spiritual in order to attain to spiritual communion with God. This, we think, would have been required even if man had not sinned. His trial in the garden and the provision made for him in the tree of life were designed to effect this higher birth. It would have been a painless one. Now it requires being joined with Christ in His sufferings and death upon the cross, a repentance for sin and faith to be delivered from the power of evil. But still underneath this redemption from sin through a painful birth and mortification of the old man, there is the deeper and more comprehensive work of glorifying the natural and rising into the spiritual, the immortal and eternal.

This work is reached by individual men, not as separate and isolated individuals, but as members of an organism. Christianity is an objective constitution. In the elevation of men from the natural into the spiritual the two forces, the objective and the subjective, are constantly and mutually interactive. Just as we become members of the nation by a process of incorporation into the body politic, in which process the national life, as a real objective power, apprehends us, and we in turn apprehend it, so it is in the Christian's growth into citizenship in the kingdom of God. Citizenship in the nation is the result of the national life and the individual life interacting—we mean here citizenship, not merely as an objective status, but as a full developed life in the individual. He must be a member of the nation in order to partake of its life. On the other hand

he may belong to the external body of the nation and yet resist its spirit and life, and thus mar his own growth into true inward citizenship. As important for this birth and growth of the citizen as the national life is, so important is the objective life and spirit of Christianity for the individual Christian.

Now let us see to what end all this discussion tends. In order to see this we must here meet the question as to the character and function of the Church in man's salvation. The distinction brought in through Protestantism between the visible and invisible church is here important. In Romanism Christianity and the visible church are regarded as identical. They are one and the same. Whoever is joined with the visible church is necessarily, *ipso facto*, in living union with Christianity. Through the sacraments, *ex opera operato*, the individual is made a member of Christ. The Protestant doctrine does not thus identify Christianity and the visible church, but neither does it separate them. The relation between the two has been explained by introducing the term ideal church and actual church.\* A member of the late peace-commission, whose views we highly respect, compared the ideal, or true, church to a statue in the process of being gradually chiseled out of a block of marble. The statue is, so to speak, in the mass of marble, but much of the crude material must be chipped away before the statue can emerge and stand forth in living beauty. Or as there was an Israel in the Israel of the Jewish Commonwealth, so there is an ideal church coming forth to actualization in the visible church. The Jewish Commonwealth was the organism in which God's Spirit wrought for the spiritual welfare of the

\* We may explain here that, in our use of the term *ideal*, we do not mean the Church in thought, or as a mere mental conception, as antithetic to *real*, but in a *substantial* sense in antithesis to the *actual*, just as we speak of the *idea* of the beautiful, the true and the good, as objective substantial entities. The ideal Church is the spiritual, real Church, which is only partially and imperfectly realized in the actual Church. These terms seem to us to be more appropriate than the terms visible and invisible Church.

Jews. Membership in it was made essential to partake in its grace. The soul that was uncircumcised was to be cut off. Our Lord said to the woman at the well of Samaria, "salvation is of the Jews." And yet there always were noted isolated exceptions to this order. Such examples we read of in the Old Testament, and such there were in the New, as the Syrophenician woman. Yet the rule stood, salvation is found only in Judaism. But not all in external Judaism came to possess its grace unto salvation.

So we may say, the actual Church of Christ, having the Word and the Sacraments, is the organization in and through which men are united with Christ and made subjects of His saving grace. Christ has ordained the means of grace necessary for the salvation of men. In order to receive His grace they must use these means. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." We may hold to the rule here also, "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*," and yet we may not absolutely limit the operation of divine grace. But its extraordinary operation is certainly not for those who understand the means of grace and wilfully reject them. In any case absolutely, there can be no salvation without union with Christ, who is the only source of eternal life. And then we may see how it is also that not all who are in the visible church are necessarily living members.

Here, then, we are confronted with an order or constitution of divine grace, a supernatural new creation, that is in the world and yet not of the world. What we mean by the *Objective in Christianity* is just this organic constitution, the generic factor of Christianity as distinguished from subjective individual Christian experience. Both these factors, the objective and subjective, are realities, and should be regarded as such in man's elevation to his eternal spiritual destiny. For healthy growth in the Christian life these two should be in proper equilibrium.

In order to make due account of the objective in Christianity it is necessary to have a right conception of the general headship of Christ in His relation to the church. He is universal

King and Lord over all things, but besides this He is head of the church. This is the special realm in which He lives and rules through His Spirit. This headship, as we have seen, and as St. Paul portrays it, is like to that of the first Adam in relation to the race. As Adam's act in the fall affected not only himself but the whole race, so Christ's work carries with it a power for the new race of believers. In a very profound sense His acts are theirs. They all die with Him, and with Him are raised unto new life in union with His resurrection. The way in which St. Paul refers to this clearly implies that he has reference to something deeper than the subjective experience only of believers. They have died with Christ unto sin even before this death has become actualized in their experience. It is made rather the reason or ground for their not living in sin any longer. "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin," as if he should say, "in your being united to Christ His death has already become your death, and for this reason now live accordingly as those that are dead." In the same way His resurrection reaches to and affects all His people. It is an accomplished fact in and for them. By it they are united with His resurrection state, even though actually they must yet die before this resurrection can be fully actualized in their experience.

This is a very different thing from looking at the death and resurrection of Christ as merely *instrumental* in procuring their redemption. It is an entirely different Christology. Christ is viewed not merely as being the *instrument*, but especially as being the *source* of their salvation. This necessarily also brings His *person* into the foreground in the work of redemption. This is more than His work; it is that from which His work derives its efficacy. This gives a new meaning to His *incarnation*. The meaning of this is not exhausted by regarding it as necessary in order that He might die on the cross, but it at once becomes a perennial fact, the mystery of all mysteries.

And now we get, as has been said, into a new Christology. The first division of the Church Year in which, starting with



the incarnation at Christmas, all the great epochs and events in His life are celebrated, attains a new significance. According to the other Christology it was hardly understood why the incarnation, or birth of Christ, should be celebrated. As an event past and gone, and only instrumental to other events in His life, it was difficult to see how it was directly related to man's redemption. And even His death became significant rather in the form of doctrine than of fact. That it was of service as making satisfaction for man's sin could be understood, but as a perennial fact that stands constantly united with the death unto the old Adamic life of His people could not be understood, and accordingly its celebration on Good Friday began to die out whenever, and just to the extent, this mechanical Christology prevailed.

Hence so far as it goes we are prepared to welcome the new line of Christological thought taken up at Andover, which forms the very life-centre, we think, of what has come to be styled "new theology." It brought with it at once a leading article, in the series of editorials, on the *Incarnation*, and it forms a moulding principle in the treatment of Eschatology. Whether it has been properly adjusted and applied to this difficult and mysterious realm of Christian theology it is not for us to say; we are quite sure it is the central principle around which all theology should revolve.

This view of the objective in Christianity brings with it also a proper view of the church. This will be viewed as an organism, the "body of Christ," as St. Paul calls it. It is a new supernatural constitution in which believers are living members. Keeping in mind the distinction between the ideal and the actual church, it will at once appear how we make due account of the means established in the visible church, without falling into the ecclesiasticism of Romanism. Infant baptism is now understood as of real meaning and force. Having a proper view of the objective constitution of Christianity, it can be seen how the establishment of certain relationships can have significance before a subjective change in the subject begins.

As the right of citizenship inures to the child of a citizen, and is of great account, even though the child does not as yet know its meaning, or actualize it in its subjective experience, so children of believers through Christian baptism are made to occupy openly and confessedly their status in the kingdom of grace. It will no longer be questioned how such an ordinance can benefit a child before it comes to years of knowledge. Our Saviour Himself was circumcised in order to possess His proper membership in the Jewish economy; and the rite has great significance even for His life, for though He was free from all sin, yet He needed the means of grace in that economy to help Him in His contest with the kingdom of evil.

There is a danger here, 'tis true, that must be carefully avoided, a danger from which our own Ref. theology in past years did not entirely escape, viz., of putting the church in the place of Christ. But this will be avoided if the subjective side of the Christian life is properly guarded. Christ is in His church, and being in connection with the church the believer has access to Him directly, just as the life of a tree is in all its parts, and every leaf and branch partakes directly of that life, even though this is conditioned by its being united to the tree. We are not to think of the church as being between the believer and Christ, but rather as being His body, and therefore animated by His life at every point. The objective relationship formed by membership in the church must attest itself by the experience of the believer, otherwise he is a dead branch and is to be cut off. But the fact that some branches are dead does not destroy the importance of being a branch in order to have life.

It was one of the weaknesses of Pietism in the seventeenth century, under Spener and others, that it lost sight too much of the objective in Christianity. True, it warred mainly against a lifeless, formal orthodoxy; but it undervalued the significance of the Church and its appointments in order to lay all stress on the individual life. So also it undervalued the office of theology. It did not make proper account of the moulding influence

of Christianity upon world-forces and world-interests, if we may so name them, upon science and art, and upon questions pertaining to the social economy. Christianity must mould these general forces of the world's life, as well as individual life; otherwise its work is incomplete. The world is not made Christian merely by the conversion of individuals, simply because the world is made up of a great deal more than individuals. If a heathen nation is to be Christianized, for example, its whole national life must be Christianized, its system of government, its political doctrines, its philosophy, its education, its social customs, etc.

Pietism, in its emphasizing the subjective factor in religion, always tends, in this way, to undervalue the objective forces it exerts. Methodism, the English Pietism of the eighteenth century, did this in its early history. It tended to disregard education, had little to do with theology, and looked upon the secular life of the world generally as something foreign. A great change has taken place in this form of church life in later times, whereby it has largely escaped its earlier defects, while it seeks to retain its strong qualities. Even the personal piety that pietism produces is in great danger of running into weaknesses and defects. It tends to develop a narrow Christian character, becomes separatistic, and even selfish. It begets in men an all-pervading desire to gain heaven as the end of the Christian life, and this sometimes becomes mere selfishness. Then, too, in general, it lacks depth. The individual is always weak in the degree in which he fails to realize the objective forces in which his life stands. This is true of man's natural, secular life. In order to be strong, he must be conscious of being *en rapport* with the objective forces of the world's life. The same is true of the Christian life in relation to the general life of Christianity.

Now, without emphasizing subjective piety less, a healthy churchly spirit tends to correct these weaknesses of pietism. Instead of resting simply in the emotional life, in the feelings, it perceives the importance of being grounded in doctrine. It

lays stress on the activity of faith as being something more than mere feeling. Therefore it makes account of teaching and indoctrinating the young in the church. It maintains the old idea of catechization, and carries it out in practice.

As we have seen, such churchly spirit, as it apprehends the objective in Christianity, makes earnest with the great facts in the life of Christ in the order of the church year. There is a profound meaning in this, as we saw when referring to Christology. These facts are viewed, not as something past and gone, as so many instrumentalities simply in the scheme of redemption, which, having accomplished their purpose, have no further direct relation to the Christian life; but they are held up as ever-living facts that, in a sense, repeat themselves in Christian regeneration and sanctification.

We have, perhaps, said enough to illustrate what we mean by the objective in Christianity. The subject has its application in various directions. It teaches the significance of the Church and its ordinances for our personal Christian life. We frequently hear it said: "religion is a personal matter between each man and God." Many believe that they can just as well go directly to Christ, as they phrase it, and therefore the Church has nothing to do directly with their religious life. The Church is well enough to bring Christians into combination for the purpose of carrying out certain measures. But if we conceive of Christianity as a general life from Christ, revealing itself in the organism of the Church, it becomes clear that, if one wishes to share in this life, he must become a member of this organism, and that the sacraments are not mere empty forms.

It teaches us not to be carried away in pietistic movements that are purely subjective. Much of the evangelism current at the present time is of this sort. It seeks mainly to work on the feelings. Its methods appear to us to differ very much from the way in which our Lord preached the gospel. He avoided excitement and mere enthusiasm; it courts this. He discouraged the selfish spirit of confessing and proclaiming

Him for the sake of certain advantages they might expect to gain by doing so; it seems to encourage this by laying so much stress on simply escaping hell and gaining heaven. He held up a life of self-denial, bearing the cross, and sought to probe their motives, in order that they might be led only by the truth; it seems rather to aim at overwhelming those addressed by appeals to feelings and fears, and thus to bring about a sudden and hasty decision. Such missions of evangelists may serve some good purposes; but they need to be carefully guarded from running into fanaticism, as pietism in Germany did in the end. Especially should pastors guard against substituting their methods in place of the tried method of catechization. We doubt very much whether Mr. Moody's method would maintain its interest and wear as a regular thing in a congregation. It does not seem to be in full harmony with the life and customs of our Reformed Church. Years ago it was tried and found wanting. Its tendency is to make some dissatisfied with the regular ordinary work of their own pastors, inasmuch as it appears to produce results at once for which they must labor a long time. But the regular way, we think, is the safest and best.

But we may, in conclusion, apply our subject also directly to the individual Christian life. We have remarked that any individual life is strong and deep in the degree in which it stands consciously in the general life in which it has its ground. No single human life is isolated. The spiritual and eternal underlies our life in time and space, and we are joined with others in internal association and fellowship with the unseen world. The Christian stands in the life of Christ, which animates all believers in the communion of saints. The union here is deeper than conscious thought and will. We may not know or understand just how our life is joined with the invisible spiritual world; but we may and should be conscious of the fact itself, and we should cultivate this consciousness. It adds to our spiritual strength to do so, just as it strengthens character in its natural form to cultivate a conscious sense of our union

with the general world-life in which we stand. What else did St. Paul mean by saying: "I look not at the things that are seen, but at the things that are unseen," etc.? How else can we make due account of the ministry of good angels, spoken of in the Scriptures? Do Christians generally make earnest with their faith in this ministry? Or, rather, do they seek, as they should, to bring this belief into the sphere of conscious thought? It is a great thing to cultivate a sense of this conjunction of individual Christian life with the life of the angelic world. It helps to give reality, in our thinking, to the spiritual world, to see before the mind these real heavenly beings, as ministering to our spiritual wants. It removes the vagueness that too much attaches to that world in our thinking. To many the spiritual world is scarcely more than a mental abstraction in their consciousness. What though they are invisible to natural sight! "Blessed are those that have not seen and yet have believed." And, in general, it is a source of strength to know that our Christian life is in conjunction with spiritual forces broader and deeper than our changing personal life. Above all is it profitable to think of this life of Christianity as joined with Christ. This is to cultivate a sense of our alliance with victory over the world of darkness, of sin and death, and this brings with it assurance of eternal life in Him; for, "who shall separate us from the love of Christ?"

The *realism* advocated in this article, we feel assured, is in harmony with the doctrine of the person of Christ set forth by the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians, and of the Church in his Epistle to the Ephesians, and still more with the teaching of our Lord Himself, when He says: "I am the vine, ye are the branches," "Ye in me, and I in you," and with the position in general which He assumes in relation to the new creation which has its source in Him.

## II.

### THE HOLY SPIRIT: HIS PERSONALITY AND WORK.

BY REV. C. R. LANE, PH. D.

ALL who receive the Scriptures as a Divine revelation admit that as opposed to the Polytheism of the Heathen, God is one: *Hear, O Israel, Jehovah, our God, is one Jehovah*; but these same persons, agreeing perfectly among themselves as to the unity of the Divine nature, differ very much in their views in regard to the mode of the Divine existence;—some holding that God is one as to person as well as in nature, and others affirming, in opposition to the bare solitariness of God, that, in the unity of the Divine nature there are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and that these three are all equal, each to each, in the possession of Divine attributes, and therefore equally worthy of and entitled to Divine honor.

Again: It is admitted by both parties that the truth or the error of the view taken of the mode of the Divine existence, and also of the view that must in consequence be taken of the system of theology logically and historically connected with that view, is determined by the view taken of the personality of the Holy Spirit. For, if the Holy Spirit is a Divine person, then of course the unity of the Divine nature as to personality is not true; and if, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit is not a Divine person, but only a Divine influence, then there is nothing left on the other side of the controversy worth contending for; because there are none who hold that a system salvation requires a Divine person as its ground, who do not also hold that it requires a Divine person in order to its effectual application. On the view taken of

## THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,

therefore, depends the view which must be taken of the natural condition of men as lost, and also of the provision which must be made in order to their deliverance from that condition, both as to its ground and the means of its application. There is nothing, therefore, that the Scriptures reveal more important either in theory or in practice than what they reveal concerning the Holy Spirit; and, in order to determine what that is, the first and the most important question to be answered is, What is a person?

By the word person, when used in reference to finite beings, is meant, *the individual subsistence of a rational nature*. This definition implies 1st, that the subject stands out by itself, a *suppositum*, that is, it is neither a part nor a property of any other thing, but a substance indivisible into parts and irresolvable into elements; and 2d, that it is rational. Put into the concrete form, this definition is, A person is a substance which exists separately from all other substances, and has rational as opposed to instinctive intelligence, that is, such intelligence that it prefers one thing to another, chooses it, for a reason.

But this, of course, is not the sense in which those who hold a pluri-personality in the Divine nature use the word person, when they apply it to God; because, if it was, then the great objection made to the doctrine of the Trinity would be valid, that is, the alleged Trinity in Unity would be by the definition simply Tri-theism; and as opposed to it, the doctrine of the Divine unity as to person would be true, and the controversy at an end. At this point, therefore, it becomes necessary for those who reject the personal unity of God to state precisely what they mean by a Divine person. One way of doing this, as satisfactory perhaps as any other, is to institute a comparison between Divine personality and our own finite personality, pointing out in what respects the two are alike and in what they differ.

Stated from this direction, a Divine person is not a sub-



sistence separate as to substance from all others, as a finite person is; but it subsists with other persons in a substance that is numerically one and identically the same. In this respect, therefore, the two personalities, the Divine and the human, are direct opposites. For, in the one case, the substance of the different persons is not identical, but similar in the sense that the substance of each has the same essential properties; while in the other case, the same substance is common to each of the Divine subsistences. By the necessity of the case, therefore, the difference which distinguishes each Divine person from the others, must be found, if it exists, in some property peculiar to each person as related to the others. The First person, for example, is distinguished from the Second and the Third, as Trinitarians allege, by the fact that to Him, and not to Them, belongs paternity; and the Third person differs from the Second in that He is of the First (*Filioque*) not in the sense that He is begotten, but by way of procession. Hence the Divine persons are so intimately related, the substance being one, that what either person does, God does; and so distinct, that what is true of one person may or may not be true of either of the others. It is true, for example, that God created the world and that the Son created it; that God quickens and the Holy Spirit quickens; that God was incarnate and so was the Son, but the Father was not incarnate, neither was the Holy Spirit. It is not, therefore, an arbitrary Canon of Interpretation, adopted to bring the Scriptures into harmony with the doctrine of the Trinity, but one that grows out of the very nature of the doctrine, to say, on the one hand, that What either of the Divine persons does, God does; and on the other, that, What is true of one of the Divine persons is not necessarily true of both or either of the others.

In regard to this statement, the 1st remark is that the plurality of God may be true. For there is no more absurdity in saying that God viewed in one aspect is one and viewed in another is diverse, unless within the bounds of our certain knowledge the statement is self-contradictory, than

there is in saying that man viewed in different aspects is mortal and immortal; and, in this particular case, our knowledge of the possibilities of things is not such that we are competent to decide that one Divine person can be distinguished from another only by that separation of substance which distinguishes finite persons.

2d. We do certainly know that the same reasons for such separation as exist among finite persons do not exist in regard to Divine persons. For, on the one hand, finite persons, because they are finite, could not fail sometimes to differ among themselves in their views of truth and therefore also as to matters of duty. The same substance, therefore, would be at variance with itself in regard to matters that cannot be compromised; and therefore the same substance would be at the same time and in reference to the same thing both innocent and guilty, the object both of praise and of blame; and this would make moral government, that is, government by way of protecting the innocent and punishing the guilty, simply an impossibility, the contradiction being in the thing itself. But among Divine persons there can be no difference of views and no difference of Counsel, and to them no accountability can attach. It is, therefore, within the limits of our certain knowledge that one thing, and as far as we know, the only thing, certainly the most important thing, that necessitates separation of substance among finite persons, namely, that there may be no impassable barrier between them arising out of the views taken of right and wrong, does not exist, and cannot, among Divine persons.

3d. The difficulties admitted to pertain to this subject, viewed as mysteries are not valid objections to it as to the only persons with whom there is any controversy. Because self-existence is as mysterious, as much opposed to dependent existence and as inconceivable, as the co-existence of different rational agents in one substance can be to an agent subsisting by itself. The same thing is true also of God's Omnipotence. For while we know something of that kind of power which produces effects by the use of intermediate appliances, means; we know nothing

of power as the property of mere Will. For God is stronger than we are, not as the man is stronger than a child, but His power differs from ours in kind. For He speaks, and it is done without the intervention of means; He commands and it stands fast. To Him, therefore, the distinction of easy and difficult, to us real, does not exist, for with Him to will and to do are one and the same thing; and it is as easy to will one thing as another.

4th. The definition of a finite person failing totally in its application to a Divine person as to separation of substance, it remains to inquire whether the other specifications of the definition apply, namely, Whether the Holy Spirit is a distinct agent possessing intelligence and exercising choice.

This point must be determined by the authority of the Scriptures alone; for outside of them there is no trace of it; unless it be found in the fact, that, as far as known, God has never made a solitary living being. In Nature everything has its fellow.

First: The Holy Spirit, whether He or it, is a power, influence, or person, is something distinct from the Father;—the Father, for distinctness from the Son, would prove nothing, because the Divinity of the Son is itself denied by all who reject the personality of the Spirit; and He or it is also something different from God taken absolutely.

1. The Holy Spirit is not the same as the Father. For in the account given of our Lord's Baptism, Matt. 3: 16-17, Mark 1: 9-11, Luke 3: 21-22, the Father and the Holy Spirit are clearly distinguished, the one as speaking, and the other as descending; the one as heard, and the other as seen clothed in a bodily form; and the Evangelist John, 1: 32-33, distinguishes between Him who sent John, the Baptist, and the Holy Spirit, whose manifested presence was to identify the Messiah. Equally distinct is the difference, John 14: 16-17, between giving and being given, and in verse 26 between sending and being sent; and in Eph. 3: 14-16, the Father and the Holy Spirit are presented, the one as the ultimate and

the other as the immediate source of inward spiritual strength.

2. The Holy Spirit is something different from God taken absolutely. For in the Acts 5: 32, 2 Cor. 5: 5, 1 Thess. 4: 8, God is the giver and the Holy Spirit the gift. In 1 Cor. 2: 9, 10, God is the revealer and the Holy Ghost the medium of the revelation; the Holy Ghost is a searcher, and God the object of His search; and in 1 John 3: 24, 4: 12, 13, the presence of the Holy Spirit is the evidence that God dwells with His people.

Secondly: The Holy Spirit possesses rational intelligence. For He convinces men of sin by the use of arguments, John 16: 7-11; invites them to accept the blessings of the Gospel, Rev. 22: 17; He is a teacher, Mark 13: 11, Luke 12: 11-12; a witness, Acts 20: 21-24; Heb. 10: 15; 1 John 5: 7-8; and He is also a guide, Rom. 8: 14; and an intercessor, verse 26.

Thirdly: The Holy Spirit exercises choice. For, 1. Choice is the natural outcome of rational intelligence, and it is implied as a necessary element in every act of arguing, inviting, teaching, witness-bearing, guiding and interceding.

2. The Holy Ghost selects certain men, and not others, and sends them forth to the performance of particular duties, Acts 13: 1-4; determines when the Gospel shall and shall not be preached, Acts 16: 6-10; and He is the author of miraculous gifts, which He bestows, this gift rather than that, on one man rather than another, according to His will, 1 Cor. 12: 4-11.

These representations, given in the Scriptures, of the Holy Ghost meet all the requirements of the case, namely, the Holy Spirit is something different from God taken absolutely or as Father; He is rationally intelligent; and He exercises choice. He is, therefore, neither a property of, nor an influence emanating from, another; but He is in and of Himself inherently a personal agent.

This view of the Holy Spirit as a distinct voluntary agent is still further confirmed; 1. By two passages of Scripture, in each of which are found all the required specifications. In

John 15: 26-27, the Spirit of truth is distinguished from the Father as sent by Him to bear witness, which requires both the possession of knowledge (intelligence) and the disposition to communicate what He knows; and in ch. 16: 13-15, the Spirit is not the Father. He glorifies Christ (He knows His excellence and makes it known); and He guides (leads the way) into all the truth, implying both the knowledge of what the truth is and the willingness to impart it to others.

2. The Holy Spirit is a person as opposed to a principle; because principles do not strive, Gen. 6: 3, but operate uniformly according to their nature, nor can a principle be vexed, Isa. 63: 10, because it has no feelings to be excited nor patience to be tried; neither can a principle be grieved, Eph. 4: 30, because it has no hopes to be disappointed; it can neither be tempted, Acts 5: 9, because it has no passions to be inflamed or desires to be gratified; nor insulted, Heb. 10: 29, because it has no self-respect to be wounded; nor can it be sinned against, Matt. 12: 31-32, because a principle, as such, is unintelligent, and therefore it can take no cognizance of the way it is used or misused, and therefore it can entertain no feelings of complacency or resentment, or of approbation or of disapprobation.

3. The personality of the Holy Spirit gives meaning and adds force to the words used in Baptism, Matt. 28: 19, and in the Benediction, 2 Cor. 13: 14. For if the Holy Ghost is merely a property of the Father or an influence emanating from Him, then it is included in the Father, and then the words, *And of the Holy Ghost*, are mere surplusage, certainly as far as any obligations assumed in Baptism are concerned, or any benefits acquired by or derived from it. And, if the Holy Spirit is a principle, then *Communion* with it is simply impossible, because a principle has no affections, and therefore it can have no sympathies, no likes and no dislikes. Or, again, if the Spirit is only an influence, then it is not easy to understand how it can perform some of the works ascribed to it. For all an influence can do is to operate on its object as being what it

is, persuasive or dissuasive as it is or is not in accord with the nature of the agent on whom it is exerted; but an influence cannot change the nature of its object. Any power, therefore, that an influence can exert, differs essentially from that exerted by the Holy Spirit, which changes the nature of its object, regenerating, John 3: 5-8, and renewing it, Titus 3-5.

4. The allegation that the Holy Spirit is a personal agent is still further confirmed by the general tenor of the Scriptures. For, while it is freely admitted that the word spirit often means a power or influence or gift, it is also true that the words, the Spirit of God, The Spirit of the Lord, The Holy Spirit and The Spirit of Christ occur in the Scriptures so often, and their predicates are so various, that the conscientious and consistent interpretation of the Scriptures imposes a hard task on those who exclude all personal properties and acts from what the Spirit is and does. And the more especially is this true, because those who deny the personality of the Holy Spirit must also, and they admit that they must, find some way of interpreting in harmony with their views of the personal unity of God all those passages of Scripture, which appear on the surface, at least, to teach that the Lord Jesus Christ is Divine as well as human; and also all that appear to teach that He gave Himself not simply as our example, but also as a sacrifice to satisfy Divine justice for our sins; because both parties admit that all they affirm or deny in regard both to the Divinity of Christ and His satisfaction to Divine justice must, as against each other, stand or fall together as essential parts of two systems of Soteriology radically different as to the view taken by each, on the one hand, of the difficulty to be remedied, and therefore also on the other, of the remedy itself and of the means by which it is to be applied effectually unto salvation.

The Holy Spirit, therefore, is not simply a principle, because He is neither impassable in His nature nor uniform in His operations; nor merely an influence, because He not only incites and restrains, but He changes the nature of the objects

on whom He exerts His power; and He is something more than a Divine property, because He is something different from God taken either as Father or simply as God. While, therefore, He is not a separate substance as a finite person is He is distinct in His agency, because He does that which the Father as such does not do; and He does it by way of rationally discriminating one thing from another. The analogy, therefore, is such as abundantly justifies the application of the word person to Him, as the most appropriate human designation of what the Scriptures represent Him to be.

In discussing the other part of this subject, namely,

#### THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT,

His personality will be assumed as proved, and also the whole doctrine of the Trinity. For the difficulty of the pluri-personality of God does not lie in the fact that there are three persons, neither more nor less, but in the fact that there are more than one. For it is as easy to believe, on proper evidence, that there is any number of persons in the unity of the Divine nature, as it is to believe that the number is greater than one.

The work of the Spirit naturally divides itself into two main branches, His work in the kingdom of Nature, and that in the kingdom of Grace.

In Nature the work of the Spirit appears 1st to be not specifically the creation of matter, but that of reducing it to order. For *the earth*, the Universe, after the matter of which it is composed had been created, *was without form and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.*

In immediate connection with the mention of the Spirit's agency, the process of reducing Chaos to order begins. The light was created, and the firmament. The waters were gathered into one place, and the dry land appeared; and the world as it now is stood forth. *By his Spirit he hath garnished the heavens. By the word of the Lord were the heavens made,*

and all the hosts of them, namely the stars which adorn the heavens, by the breath, the Spirit, of his mouth.

2nd. The Spirit is the efficient agent which works in and by Providential means, such as the heat and the cold, the rain and the sunshine.

The principle of life, whether animal or vegetable, is a mystery, and the explicit language of the Scriptures is, *The Lord causeth grass to grow for the cattle, and herb for the service of man: that he may bring forth food out of the earth; and also, Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth.*

3rd. No where in the Scriptures is the creation of man referred to either of the Divine persons specifically, but the Holy Spirit, as distinguished from the Father and the Son is the author of special endowments; He qualified Moses and the seventy Elders as the rulers of the people, Num. 17: 16-17, 24: 5; Joshua for the conquest of the promised land, Num. 27: 18-20; the Judges for the performance of their special duties as deliverers, Judges 3: 10, 6: 34; Bezaleel with mechanical skill; and He is also the author of the excellencies of our Lord's human nature, given without measure, John 3: 34; the Spirit of the Lord, the Spirit of wisdom and understanding, the Spirit of counsel and might, the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and shall make him of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord, Isai. 11: 1-2.

The general statement of the work of the Spirit in the natural world, therefore, as far as His agency is revealed in the Scriptures, appears to be this: He completes the work begun in the creation of matter by reducing unformed matter to order, beautifying and adorning it; He works efficiently in natural and Providential means, and He is the author of the special endowments of men.

The other general branch of this subject relates to the work of the Holy Spirit in the kingdom of Grace. This work is in general analogous to that in the kingdom of Nature, and it can be stated in like general terms, namely, the Holy Spirit



applies the work of Christ effectually to the minds of men, so that the promise made to Christ in the Covenant of Redemption is fulfilled, that He should see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.

When this work is considered in detail, the 1st remark is, that men in their natural state are dead in trespasses and sins, they walk in disobedience and are the children of wrath, Eph. 2: 1-3. The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him, 1st Cor. 2: 14; and as far as they are not foolishness, they are the objects of his hatred, for the carnal mind, man as he is since the Fall, is enmity against God, not subject to His law, nor remaining as he is by nature, can he be, Rom. 8: 5-8; but the Holy Spirit convinces men of sin and reveals Christ to them in such a way that those who once showed the sinfulness of their nature by their sinful conduct, now show that they have been washed and sanctified and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit of our God, 1st Cor. 6: 9-11. They sow no longer to the flesh but to the Spirit, Gal. 6: 7-8; and they live and walk in the Spirit, Gal. 5: 16-26; thereby showing that they have been regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and have become new creatures, a new creation, in Christ Jesus, because they love what they once hated, and they receive and rejoice in Him whom they once rejected.

2ndly. In those thus born again, the Spirit dwells, makes His home, Rom. 8: 9, and sheds abroad in their hearts the love of God, 5: 5, makes them free from the law of sin and death 8: 2, by delivering them from the law as the rule of justification, Gal. 5: 18, and aids them in mortifying the deeds of the body, Rom. 8: 13. He is the Spirit of adoption, Gal. 4: 6, Rom. 8: 15-16, and therefore the Spirit by whom they have access, freely of God and of right as children, unto the Father, Eph. 2: 18; He seals them unto the day of redemption, 2d Cor. 1: 22, Eph. 4: 30; secures obedience and purification, 1st Peter 1: 2, 22; so that they grow up into a holy temple in the Lord, a habitation of God through the Spirit, 1 Cor. 1: 16, Eph. 2: 21-22.

He is the Spirit of prayer, Rom. 8 : 26, Eph. 6 : 18, of peace and joy, Rom. 14 : 17, and of hope, 15 : 13. His fruits are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, meekness, temperance, Gal. 5 : 22-23. They live in the Spirit, and, in a measure, they walk in the Spirit. They are one body in Christ, made so by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, 1st Cor. 12 : 12-13, the body of which Christ is the Head, and they are growing up unto Him in all things, being changed from glory to glory as by the Spirit of the Lord, 2d Cor. 3 : 18.

3dly. The Holy Spirit, in exercising His life-giving power on souls spiritually dead, works where and how He chooses, because He is not confined, as we are, to the use of external means in order to secure an end. Whatever, therefore, He may do in exceptional cases, if any such in fact exist in His administration of the Kingdom of Grace, He ordinarily works in connection with the truth which He has revealed in the Scriptures, 2d Sam. 23 : 1-3, Psalm 95 : 7 with Heb. 3 : 7, 2d Peter 1 : 21. On the day of Pentecost, the promise given, Acts 1 : 8, was fulfilled, and the truth, as presented by the Apostles, Ch. 2 : 22-36, led many, not all, who heard it to say, Men and brethren, What shall we do? vrs. 37-42. The same union of the Word and Spirit is found in the case of the Ethiopian eunuch 8 : 26-40, of Saul of Tarsus 9 : 6, 17 ; of the Roman Centurion, 10 : 1-48, 11 : 1-18 ; and in the History of the Work of Grace in Antioch, vrs. 22-26.

4thly. But while the work of the Holy Spirit in Nature is similar to His work in Grace, reducing unformed matter to order in the one and applying the work of Christ effectually in the other, yet the greatness of the power exercised, displayed if there were any intelligent creatures to observe it, occurs in degree, in precisely opposite directions. For, as far as we know, the Spirit performed His greatest work in Nature, when He laid hold on, *moved on the face of*, the mighty mass of matter existing in its simple elements, the Nebular Hypothesis being assumed as true, and formed the Heavens and the Earth that now are. For it is simply impossible to believe that masses

of matter, mingled in right proportion and sufficient in quantity to form systems single and multiple, would be thrown off at the right time, at the right distance, and with the right velocity of propulsion and rotation from an unstable and heterogeneous mass so as to secure the equilibrium and stability of the whole, and so that each particular mass thrown off would form itself into a system of its own, separate from all the others, and yet united to them all by an all-pervading, ever-varying, instantaneous force;—to believe that such a result could be secured in such circumstances without the supervision of an Omniscient and Omnipotent agent is an exercise, of which the human mind is utterly incapable.

On the other hand, the greatest and the most glorious work of the Holy Spirit in the kingdom of Grace is yet in the future. For, while much has been accomplished, the great promises of the Scriptures are only in the beginning of their fulfilment. An instalment of the promise, And it shall come to pass afterward, namely, in the last days or Messianic times, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions; and also upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I pour out my Spirit, Joel 2 : 28-29;—an instalment of this promise, but not the whole of it, the Church received on the day of Pentecost. For, I will pour water on him that is thirsty and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offspring: and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water-courses, Isai. 44 : 3-4, Mic. 4 : 1-2. The result of this great and general out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, described under the form of temporal blessings, is found in the thirty-fifth and the sixtieth chapters of the Prophecies by Isaiah, and connected in chapter 11 : 1-9 with the coming of our Lord in the flesh, and the power of the Holy Ghost exercised first upon Christ as to His human nature and then through Him upon all the nations of the Earth.

The last work of the Holy Spirit in the kingdom of Grace,

as far as this world is concerned and involving the total destruction of the kingdom of Satan as the specific opposite of the Church is the resurrection of the dead. For if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you.

And now, in closing this discussion, it is proper to turn attention again to what must always be the matter of chief interest in any consideration of this subject, namely, the personality of the Holy Spirit. For this point gained or lost, everything considered important by both the contending parties is also gained or lost.

In addition, therefore, to what was then said directly on the personality of the Spirit, it may now be said by way of inference, that, To form Chaos into Cosmos—To order the seasons, so that man and beast are provided for—To administer the affairs of Christ's Kingdom, by way of applying His work effectually to the salvation of men, that is, enlightening their eyes as to the nature of sin and Christ as the Saviour of sinners, renewing and sanctifying them, protecting and defending them both by the ordinary operations of Providence and by special intervention, dwelling with them as a Spirit revealing righteousness, and producing peace and joy—To hold in check the power and the malignity of Satan, or to over-rule both to advance the interest both of Christ and His people, and at last, to triumph over all forms and degrees of opposition, even to the extent of raising the dead—To do these things is a work that requires knowledge, wisdom and power; love, patience and forbearance; discrimination and skill, all combined in one subject, and such a combination of such things is directly contrary to the essential idea of what a property or principle or influence is; and on the other hand, it is precisely such a union of such things in one subject that constitutes our idea of a person.

From the nature, therefore, of the works which the Scriptures

ascribe to the Spirit, and the variety and kind of the qualifications necessary to perform these works, as an independent argument, the conclusion seems inevitable that nothing short of personal agency will meet the Scriptural representation of what the Holy Spirit does both in the kingdom of Nature and in the kingdom of Grace. These two representations, therefore, of the Holy Spirit, namely, of what He is, and what He does, agree with each other. For if the Holy Spirit is a Divine person, then He is competent to perform the works ascribed to Him; and if, on the other hand, He does the works ascribed to Him in the Scriptures, then He cannot but be a Divine person.

### III.

## A SECOND CHAPTER ON THE BEGINNINGS OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

BY REV. THEODORE APPEL, D.D., LANCASTER, PA.

*From 1822 to 1824.*

*The Disappointment.*—When the Rev. Dr. Milledoler accepted of the appointment to the professorship in the Seminary, there was general rejoicing throughout the churches in Maryland, Virginia, and in some parts, at least, of Pennsylvania. It now looked as if the object of many earnest prayers had been attained. Even the installation of the new professor had been arranged to take place in Baltimore, in June, 1822. The prospects were encouraging, and all things seemed to be conspiring to bring about a new and better era in the history of the Church. Never before—and but seldom since—had any portion of the denomination in this country been so induced to arise and build up the walls of Jerusalem. Never before had the people come forward so eagerly with their contributions to carry forward the work of the Lord. It is true their offerings were still promises, or, as it seems, largely in subscriptions, and a part of them might turn out to be mere empty promises, as it often happens in such cases; but the character of the ministers and laymen embarked in this enterprise forbid us to suppose that their pledges were not *bona fide*. It was their first opportunity to do something on a large scale for their Church, and they all wished to see it done.

When, therefore, Dr. Milledoler, in the spring of 1822, felt

constrained to recall his acceptance of the appointment tendered him, after holding it in his hands for a year and more, the revulsion of feeling must have been intense. Some of the more enthusiastic had gone so far as to make the future existence of the Seminary depend on the success of the Milledoler movement. Dr. Mayer seems to have had some thoughts of that kind; but, as we have seen, he soon rallied from the temptation to despondency, and agreed with others that "the Seminary must be established." During the summer of 1822, therefore, most persons probably thought that it was best to wait and hear what the Synod had to say in the fall.

*Another Effort.*—At the Synod of Harrisburg, in 1822, the subject of establishing a Seminary again claimed attention; but evidently the inspiration of the Hagerstown Synod had, in a great measure, passed away: the idea of raising a large endowment and a large salary for a professor seems to have vanished. It was now said that the next beginning ought to be made on a smaller and more economical scale. The first was out of proportion to the means and resources of the Church at the time; the second turned out to be just as much so in the other direction. The economy was now penny-wise.

Harrisburg, as more central than Frederick, or indeed any other place, presented many advantages for the location of the Institution. The congregation there was respectable, and the more intelligent members were anxious to form a union with the Seminary. Accordingly it was agreed that it should be located at Harrisburg; that the professor should teach theology and take the pastoral charge of the Reformed congregation in that place, which was then to pay him the larger part of his salary.

This proposition was strongly supported by certain intelligent laymen at Harrisburg, who no doubt regarded it as the only and the best thing that could be done for the Church in existing circumstances. It presented points of contrast with the movement that had gone before. It could not, however, be carried into execution at once, and, in the end, not at all. A

portion of the congregation were anxious to have a change of pastor; but others were not, whilst the pastor, the Rev. John Winebrenner, could not see his way clear at the time to leave what was then a distracted church, and wished to have a longer time for consideration. The matter was accordingly left to a committee to make out of it all that they could during the coming year, with the hope that the wishes of the Synod might have their weight and in due time come to be realized. But the negotiations with Harrisburg made little or no progress during the year, and most persons began to think that they would never amount to anything.

*The Classis of Maryland.*—But whilst the door seemed to be shut on the Susquehanna, the zeal of the friends of the Seminary suffered no decline; it rather increased in strength, as we might expect, when we remember that it was based on principle, and not on a mere sentiment. There were some persons who were pondering and praying over the matter, and when the Synod met at Baltimore in 1823, they had something to propose. The Classis of Maryland, under the conviction that, if their cherished object could not be secured in one way,—through the Synod—it might be in some other way, came with a request that they and other brethren might be allowed to form a voluntary association for the purpose of establishing an institution for the education of young men for the ministry that would, in a measure, be independent of Synodical control. That was well put under the circumstances, and it might have worked well—until the Church should be more of one mind, and all could learn how to work together. At this distant day it looks to us as if it was a pity that the Maryland brethren were not allowed an opportunity to engage in such a good work. The probability is that they would have accomplished something—more, perhaps, as individuals than the Synod itself, which was hampered by so many different opinions.

*Harrisburg still the Choice.*—But the voice of the Synod was still for concert of action. Everything seemed to favor the beginning made the year previous for the location at Harris-



burg, except that on which everything else depended. The troubles in the congregation were not yet settled, and Mr. Winebrenner was not willing to open the way for a successor.

*The Election of a Professor.*—Still it was supposed by some that remaining difficulties could be removed out of the way at no distant day, and the Synod thought it would be best to go forward and elect a theological professor. The choice lay between the pastors, Samuel Helfenstein, Lewis Mayer and Jacob C. Becker. The lot fell upon Mr. Helfenstein, pastor of the Reformed Church in Philadelphia. A College of Directors for the Seminary was appointed, consisting of the pastors, Hinsch, Hendel, Wack, Jr., Jonathan Helfenstein, Mayer, Becker, Albert Helfenstein, Reily, Isaac Gerhart, the elders, Judge Bucher and F. Kelker, of Harrisburg, and John Dieffenderfer, of Baltimore. The salary of the professor was fixed at \$500, to be paid out of the Synodical treasury. This was all that was done for a Seminary at this meeting, and the Synod, after a long discussion, for "urgent reasons," resolved to meet the year following at Bedford, Pa., in general convention. At this meeting a theological society, as it was called, in the Reformed congregation in Philadelphia, forwarded to the Synod \$112.25, which it had accumulated in small amounts for the establishment of a Seminary.

*The Rev. John Winebrenner.*—Mr. Winebrenner studied under the Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, was ordained as minister in the Reformed Church in 1820, was one of the early friends of the Seminary, was a man of considerable talent, and regarded as an earnest and popular preacher by those who sat under his ministry in his early days at Harrisburg. He gradually became one-sided and strongly emotional in his preaching, which led to distractions in his congregation. Diverging from the standards of his own church, he at length fell in with a religious movement called the Church of God, somewhat Donatistic, of which he subsequently became the head and Presiding Elder. His connection with the Reformed Church ceased by the action of Synod in 1827. Mr. Winebrenner came from a worthy Re-

formed family in Frederick County, Maryland. His relatives gave him credit for his sincerity; but none of them went with him out of the church of their forefathers.

*The Rev. Samuel Helfenstein.*—The Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, who was now called to take the place of Dr. Milledoler in the Seminary that was to be, was not inferior to him in any of the qualifications requisite to constitute him an efficient theological professor at that time. He did not possess the same prestige as Dr. Milledoler; but he was better acquainted with the field, understood its wants, and was both a theoretical as well as a practical theologian. He was an earnest, popular preacher, wrote with equal facility and accuracy in both languages, was a successful teacher of theology, a faithful pastor and a serious, conscientious Christian. He had become fully Americanized, and would have been regarded as strictly orthodox in Presbyterian or Dutch Reformed circles. In his "Doctrines of Divine Revelation," published in 1842, a popular treatise, not without merit, prepared for Christians generally, as well as to serve as a help or hand-book for students of divinity, he follows the order laid down in Dr. Dick's Theology, and does not differ from it on any essential points. He accepts of Calvin's view of the divine decrees, but rejects his doctrine of the Lord's Supper, just as Dr. Dick does, who strangely confesses that he does not understand it,—as something too obscure for him.

Dr. Helfenstein, in his desire to bring about a better state of things in the churches, fell, to some extent, under the influence of Finneyism in the course of time, which only increased his difficulties in his pastoral charge. But whilst his services could not be utilized in a regular seminary, he nevertheless prepared a number of young men for the ministry, twenty-seven of them in all, who, with some exceptions, became faithful laborers in the Lord's vineyard and devoted friends of their own church. Of a somewhat feeble and delicate constitution, by his moderation and temperance, he attained to the ninety-second year of his age, and died peacefully in the simple faith of a little child.

*Still out at Sea.*—The vexed question in the congregation at Harrisburg made no progress towards a satisfactory solution during the year 1823–24. A new Baptist denomination was germinating in the mind of the pastor, and a new Reformed school of the prophets in the minds of his elders: these were contrariwise, the one to the other, and the result was a deadlock. Nothing could be accomplished, and the suffering congregation had to wait in patience for deliverance; but as it had to wait for months and years, it lost its opportunity, and the Seminary, which would have found a congenial home in their midst, floated away to find anchorage somewhere else.

*Finds a Haven at Carlisle.*—Harrisburg was situated about eighteen miles from Carlisle, and it was quite natural that the progress of events in the one place should be reported at the other. The Reformed pastor at Carlisle, Rev. John S. Ebaugh, was interested in all the movements looking to a Seminary, and was behind no one in his zeal for its establishment at Frederick under Dr. Milledoler. As we have seen, he had pledged Cumberland County for \$13,000, to make up for it an endowment. Naturally energetic, progressive and enthusiastic, he did not like to see any enterprise moving along at a "poor, dying rate." With his sharp perceptions, he could understand that nothing would come out of the movement to make Harrisburg the centre of the Church. Quite naturally, therefore, it occurred to him that Carlisle might stand a chance for this honor.

He possessed tact, a restless, active temperament, was full of plans, and when he saw that nothing would be accomplished for the Seminary at Harrisburg, he thought that something might be done for it at Carlisle. He always affirmed that he was the means of bringing the Synod and the Trustees of the College at Carlisle together, and claimed for so doing the thanks of the Church. All the circumstances tend to show that there is no good reason for doubting the accuracy of this his own statement.

He was clear-sighted enough to perceive that it would be a

benefit to Carlisle, to his own congregation, and to himself as one of the town pastors; but there is sufficient reason for believing that at this time he was prompted by an honest desire to do what he could in establishing the long-wished-for theological school. If it could be made to promote the prosperity of single congregations, it would be only so much the better. It is the essence of the highest wisdom, when the more general interests of the Church can, in any way, help and animate such as are local, private or personal. It is only when the former are dragooned into the service of the latter, and hampered in their beneficent operations, that evil spirits have an opportunity to come up out of the pit and revel amidst the consequent disorder and confusion. It is the folly of placing the pyramid on its apex, the smallest point of support, instead of the base.

*The General Convention at Bedford.*—The Synod which met at Bedford, in 1824, was a General Convention, in accordance with the action of the previous year. The place of meeting was remote, but the attendance was good. Out of sixty-nine Reformed ministers belonging to the Synod proper, thirty-two were in attendance, with twenty elders. As no progress had been made in the negotiations with the Harrisburg Consistory in regard to a Seminary, no report was presented from that quarter. As a result there was a division of sentiment and a loss of confidence in the whole movement. Several of the Classes overtured the Synod to postpone the subject for the time being. The proposition, however, from the Trustees of Dickinson College, at Carlisle, Pa., presented by Rev. Ebaugh, of the Reformed, and Rev. Cathcart, of the Presbyterian Church, brought the Synod to face the Seminary question once more, fairly and squarely. It called for positive action in one way or another, and the reverend fathers proceeded to give the subject their careful consideration.

*The Proposition from Dickinson College.*—The document from the Board of Trustees, legally drawn up and signed by Frederick Watts, secretary, proposed that a connection should be formed between the Seminary and College, which it was

supposed would be highly advantageous to both institutions. The Board of Trustees promised the Seminary the use of a lecture-room in the college edifice, the rent of a house for a professor, a lot of ground on the college ground a hundred feet square for the erection of suitable buildings, and free access to the college library and the lectures of the college professors for the theological students. The Professor of Theology, on the other hand, was to serve in the college as Professor of History and of the German language. Many other things were, doubtless implied, all looking to a permanent union of the two institutions, and involving mutual co-operation and support.

The acceptance of this proposition meant that the Church was now to go forward and establish the long-talked-of Seminary. For various reasons, difficult now to understand or appreciate, there was a halting when the momentous question was put to vote, and the result was a tie. A tradition informs us that there was a profound sensation in the Synod, and all eyes were turned to the president, the Rev. William Hendel, of Womelsdorf, Berks County, Pa. Solemnly rising in his chair, under a deep sense of his responsibility, amidst profound silence, he cast his vote in emphatic German for the Seminary, and from that time onward settled a question that seemed so difficult to settle.

*A Note.*—Among the names of the early friends and supporters of the Seminary, none shines with a brighter or purer lustre than that of Dr. William Hendel, Jr., of Womelsdorf, Berks County, Pa. He preached the Gospel in his day kindly and faithfully, often amidst opposition and personal abuse on account of his support of the institutions of the Church. A number of his catechumens caught his spirit and became useful ministers of the church. One of these was Mr. Reily, who on a certain occasion preached for his people a sermon of great power and eloquence, with which he was much pleased. The next time when he preached himself in the same church, he tried to turn it to useful account in his own discourse. One

of the women, after service, told him that the other minister had closed the kingdom of heaven, but that he had opened it again—to all believers. She, however, was mistaken. Mr. Reily's sermon had opened the kingdom to a young man, afterwards the Rev. P. S. Fisher, and was the means of inducing him—as he once wrote—to give up the pleasures of the world and devote himself to the work of the ministry, in which he became eminently useful.

In the summer of 1836, Dr. Hendel traveled all the way from Womelsdorf to Mercersburg to take charge of the ceremonies of laying the corner-stone of the new Seminary building, at the request of Dr. Mayer, who could not be present himself. When he rode in his sulky through the village he arrested the attention of the crowd on the pavements, and every one wished to know who this stranger might be. He had a commanding physique, and looked, at first, like some distinguished statesman or civilian, who had come to honor the occasion with his presence. But his patriarchal hat, his dress and manner indicated that he might be a clergyman. When it was whispered around that it was Dr. Hendel, of Womelsdorf, the students found it difficult to restrain themselves. They wished to pull off their hats, and give him a noisy welcome; but, as Dr. Moses Kieffer informs us, they welcomed him in a better way, more in harmony with his feelings, by crowding around him and shaking the good man's hand, much as his people did in the church-yard on Sunday when he came to preach for them.

*Remarks.*—To most persons, in our day, it may seem strange that there should have been any difficulty in deciding such a question as that which came up at the Synod of Bedford. But it must be remembered that ministers in those days did not often see each other, that they had no church papers to give information or help to form public opinion, and that they had their jealousies in regard to language, German or English. Accordingly, when they met to consult for the general interest of the Church, their opinions were divergent. At Bedford all felt the necessity and usefulness of a Seminary; but doubts

were entertained whether the right time had arrived to move in such an undertaking, when as yet there was such a want of unanimity of feeling among ministers and people, attended with considerable division and distraction. Some honestly believed that the project was sure to result in another failure, and that would make matters only so much the worse. The difficulties in the way were no doubt felt by all alike, by both sides; but the progressives ruled them out and thought it was best to go forward and walk by faith.

*Dr. Mayer becomes Professor.*—After the main question was settled the Rev. Samuel Helfenstein was again appointed professor; but this time the Rev. Lewis Mayer was made his secundus. The salary was fixed at seven hundred dollars per annum, and the work of starting the Seminary and providing for it necessary books, and of supplying it with the means of support, committed to the hands of the College of Directors.

Mr. Helfenstein, for reasons that were satisfactory to his brethren, declined to accept the appointment tendered him a second time, and his secundus, Mr. Mayer, felt compelled to take his place, for reasons given hereafter in one of his letters. It appears that there was no special preference for either of the candidates. Mr. Mayer had established his reputation for scholarship, was well-known for his studious habits, and he received the cordial endorsement of his brethren. He was probably the only available competent person at that time in the Church for a position of so much responsibility.

*From 1824 to 1829.*

*The State of the Church.*—The Synod at Bedford embarked on a great and good enterprise, but the vessel was frail, the seas dark and tempestuous. Before we proceed to describe the long and dreary voyage, it seems, therefore, proper that we should give some account of the times and circumstances attending this first starting out to cross dark waters.

Past failure, had, to some extent, destroyed confidence in this entire subject of a seminary, and there was a considerable amount of indifference also, it must be confessed, in regard to

such an enterprise throughout the churches generally. It was only the comparatively few who spoke to each other and mourned over the desolations of Zion. They were, however, men of faith who believed that, with the help of God, they would succeed in the end. The opposition to the Synod, and of course to the Seminary, inaugurated at Reading in 1822, increased in intensity, and in fact became a sort of fanaticism, a *schwärmeri* of a new character, which it was not so easy at the time to resist. Some of the ministers in Eastern Pennsylvania found it difficult to maintain their position as members of the Synod: some of them yielded to the storm and went over to the Free Synod, in order to retain their influence over their people and to allay divisions and strife among them. When one of them was called to account by the Synod, he told the brethren that they should have patience with him and his people for a while, and all things would come right. The request was granted, and the promise fulfilled. Similar patience had to be exercised in other cases—but for a much longer period of time—which in the end was attended with like results.

The Rev. Benjamin Boyer, not one of the strongest men in the Church, was assured that he would get good, fat congregations, if he would become independent of Synod, but he declined; the Lord gave him work where he was needed. Some years after this the Rev. Daniel Weiser, who commenced his ministry in the midst of this turmoil, took a charge in Montgomery County, in Goshenhoppen, where the spirit of independence was rife both on the Lutheran and Reformed side, and had a long and difficult struggle with it, year in and year out, with varying degrees of success. He, however, became master of the situation in the end, and his victory brought with it lasting benefit to the people of his charge.

A portion of the giant's children, those by the strange woman, the Ishmaelites, who did not belong to the congregation, went on from bad to worse, continued to curse and swear at priestcraft—at *Pfafferei*—at the attempted union of Church and State—and to drink freely of whiskey, so that they injured the



reputation of their father's family, and caused him not a little perplexity and sorrow. It was a sad state of things, in which the wicked wished to rule over the churches, and the righteous were asked to be their obedient followers. They had their day, and their bishopric was taken away and given to another. Discipline it seems was out of the question.

*Private Theological Schools.*—The action of the Synod at Hagerstown, in 1820, forbidding ministers to give private instructions to students in theology, was a dead letter from the start. It could not well, indeed, be otherwise. According to the *Synodal-Ordnung*, published in 1805, which had the force of a constitution, ministers were allowed to instruct young men in theology, and the Synod could not deprive them of the right without first changing the fundamental law, and it did not make any attempt to do so.

The private seminary of Dr. Herman, at the Swamp, in Montgomery County, was probably the most flourishing. The students had to acquire a knowledge of the learned languages so as to understand the lectures of their teacher, which were all in easy ecclesiastical Latin. During the week they were required to sit in a school-room, transcribe the lectures of their teacher, and master their lessons during regular study hours. Thus it will appear that they enjoyed the benefit of a real theological school in which there was training. On Sundays the more advanced students had an opportunity to exercise their gifts by filling appointments for preaching in the large pastoral charge of their professor.

Mursinna's *Compendium of Theology* was one of Dr. Herman's text-books—as it was also in the Seminary at Carlisle and York—which, however, did not inoculate, as far as we know, any of the students, at least, of either of the schools with its rationalistic tendencies.

In these circumstances the beginnings of the Seminary at Carlisle came to be of a feeble character. It had no money in its treasury, no buildings, no library, and it could expect to receive only a part of the students who were studying theology

in the church at large. The old order of things had become confirmed, and it was not an easy task to change its course into a new channel. With these explanatory remarks, a few letters from the professor-elect, given at this point, will be more intelligible to our readers and throw light on the situation of affairs at this period of our history.

## VIII

*York, December 1, 1824.*

*B. C. Wolff, Esq.*

My dear Friend:—I have this day accepted the call of Synod to the professorship in the Seminary about to be established in connection with Dickinson College at Carlisle. This acceptance will bring me in contact with the faculty and students of the College in the capacity of Professor of History and German Literature. In this capacity but little will be required of me, while much will be gained to the Seminary. The Faculty and Trustees of the College have shown every disposition to favor the Seminary, and I am persuaded they will furnish every facility which may not interfere with their own proper duties. My labors in this institution will not be many, and my support small. The Trustees of the College furnish a house, and the Synod gives a salary of \$700, which, however, is not entirely certain. I see much to discourage me; but if ever we establish a Seminary, it must be done by disinterested and bold effort. If no one accepts of the professorship until it is a safe and profitable office, the Seminary can never get into operation; and the principle on which this plea of rejection is founded, if it were correct, would have justified the Reformers, the Apostles, and Jesus Himself in shrinking from the destination to which they were appointed, and leaving the world in darkness and sin, without comfort in the sorrows of life and without hope in the grave. If the Son of God gave Himself for us, tell me where the duty of disinterested, thankful devotion to His service ends! The loftiest elevation of feeling and the widest range of intellectual vigor reach no

limit. *He gave Himself for us*; and if this be so, tell me, if you can, the full import of these words.

I had much painful perplexity while I doubted about the Lord's will in this matter. But I think I have now discovered it; yet I am not entirely certain. If this work be not of God, it will yet be brought to nought; but if it be from Him, it will prosper. I am willing to go as far as I know His holy will, or think I know it; and what things are discouraging, I will leave to Him. He who created the universe out of nothing, and watches in tender mercy over all His works will never leave me nor forsake me.

The Seminary will be opened, if God has so appointed, about the first of April. The books you have received for it should be sent, about that time, to Carlisle. If you can get donations, either in money or in books, especially in theological works, do so, my friend, for His sake who redeemed you and will save you. It is important that a permanent fund should be obtained for the Professor's support, and that a good library should be secured. Give my assurances of love to my friends. They are dear to me, and will be always dear. May the Lord prepare us all for that habitation where we shall love with a holier flame and suffer no separations.

Affectionately yours,

*Lewis Mayer.*

IX

*Carlisle, May 17, 1825.*

---

The great number and variety of my duties within the last four months have left me no time for correspondence, and all my friends at a distance have therefore received little attention in this way. As you know my situation, you will not ask for an apology for my long delay in answering your last two letters.

I labored in York with unremitting application, in the last four months of my continuance there, to do all the service I could possibly render in closing my ministry among a people in whose happiness I felt a deep interest, and who probably will

be some time without a pastor. I, of course, made no preparation for my duties in the Seminary. As soon as my family affairs were arranged, I set out on a visit to the Seminaries at Princeton and New Brunswick. I returned after an absence of twenty-two days, and on the next day commenced my labors here with five students, one of whom is of the Lutheran Church. The session in the College begins to-morrow, when I shall have an increase of labor by a class of students in the German language. My theological students, with only one exception, are raw young men. I am obliged to teach them the rudiments of their Greek, and even the grammar of their own mother tongue. The course pursued at other seminaries will not suit at present in ours, when all the furniture and discipline of the mind are yet to be acquired, and even simple propositions are not easily apprehended. Instead of formal lectures, I have catechetical exercises in Scripture passages, and require the students afterwards to write out critical comments on them and to recite them to me, when I correct their mistakes and offer further illustrations. The design of these exercises is to call out the talents of the young men with full and constant exercise, to form a taste and habit of investigation and to make them acquainted with the Bible and the principles of interpretation, preparatory to Systematic Divinity. In this way I can keep them much employed, without overburdening myself; and I find that my health is not a little benefited by such a plan, whilst it is best for the students.

I am very much pleased with the professors and the Seminary at Princeton. Drs. Alexander, Miller and Hodge are excellent men, no less remarkable for their humility, mildness and benevolence than for their talents and learning. I have no doubt that the Presbyterian Church has within it other such men; but every friend to that Church and every friend of the Christian faith may rejoice that such men have been selected for so important a situation. Professor De Witt, at New Brunswick, possesses fine talents, and will become eminent; but the spirit of that institution, so far as it came under my

observation, seemed inferior to the spirit that prevails at Princeton.

*Note.*—Dr. Livingstone, the senior professor in the Seminary at New Brunswick, the corypheus and great church father of the Dutch Reformed Church, the friend also of his German brethren, fell asleep a few months before this visit of Dr. Mayer, in January, 1825.—*Editor.*

I purchased books to the amount of about \$130 with my own funds. Many others are still wanting; but I have no means to procure them. My salary is so low that I have nothing to spare, and my time is so occupied that I can turn to nothing else for an increase of support. For the last three months' service at York I have received as yet nothing, and from the congregations in the country I shall get nothing. At the same time large arrearages are due (and will continue so) from former years. Such are the golden times of ministers of the Gospel; but doubtless it is best so upon the great scale of eternity. How I shall succeed in my labors here, and what the fate of our Seminary will be, the Lord only knows. If it be His will, it must prosper, though not without pains and trials on our part; if it be not His will to give it success, it ought to fail, as it no doubt will. What is to become of me in the event of its failure is a matter about which I have at present no care. My concern is to do my duty: all the rest belongs to God. The friends of this institution must, however, remember that, without a miraculous divine interposition, it can only be permanently established by their own active and persevering exertion.

Mr. Reily left Harrisburg on the 9th inst. for Philadelphia, on his European mission. I have not heard of him since. The professors at Princeton and Dr. De Witt, of New Brunswick, were much pleased with this part of our plan. I hope the Lord will be with him. Tell my friends, and particularly your parents, that I remember them with much affection. God bless you and yours.

*Lewis Mayer.*

*The Beginning at Carlisle.*—When the theological professor

had been secured, the next thing in order was a good library and a competent temporal support for the professor, so that there might be no lack of nourishment for his mind or his body. The prospects, however, for either the one or the other were not encouraging at Carlisle. The Synod, of course, had thought of this, and instructed the Directors to provide for what was needed, and they were not remiss in their duties. Although apparently told to make brick without straw, they did much more than was expected of them.

A meeting of the Board of Superintendents was held at Carlisle in February, 1826, to consider this weighty matter. It was evident that only a few books of a suitable character could be secured in this country, and, in the depressed state of mind in the churches, comparatively little money. The Church was still in its infancy. With sixty-nine ministers in the Synod, who probably did not have, on an average, more than three hundred members under their charge, the reader may judge of its numerical strength. Some of the members had become wealthy—one here and another there; but much of the wealth was in farms, where it was inaccessible. With such an outlook at home, it was quite natural that the Superintendents should look to the fatherland for books. It was the land of books, and some money might be gathered up there also. Accordingly the Rev. James R. Reily, one of their number, was appointed to go to Germany to secure some books at least, and money also, if possible.

*Mr. Reily goes to Europe.*—The Superintendents or Directors most likely were not very enthusiastic in this project; but Mr. Reily no doubt was. So we infer from the contract which he made with them. As representatives of the Synod, they were not willing to incur any risks: Mr. Reily, on the other hand, was willing to father the losses, if there should be any, and give the Seminary all the profits, whatever they might be. He was, in fact, the originator of this movement, and with his characteristic energy determined to carry it through at all hazards, even if it should involve himself in loss.

*His Agreement.*—We here give the agreement, written out in Mr. Reily's own hand-writing, furnished to us by his son, the Rev. Dr. William M. Reily, of Allentown, Pa.:

"The agreement between the Board and James R. Reily was that the Treasurer of Synod should pay said Reily \$550 out of any moneys in the treasury, for the security of which the said Reily was to transfer to William Hendel, treasurer, twenty-two shares of the stock of the Hagerstown Bank, worth \$25 per share, on the following conditions: That if the said agent return, and is successful in his agency, and pays into the treasury the sum of \$550, that in this case the bank-stock shall be returned to him; further, if he meets with success, all his expenses are to be paid him; and in case he does not succeed, no expenses are to be allowed."

This agreement is not entirely clear to us at this late day on one point. As he did succeed in his trip, his expenses were, no doubt, paid; we presume he was paid the additional \$550 for his services, extending over a period of a year and a half, although that point is not so clear.

*His Great Success*—Our narrative will not allow us to give an extended account of Mr. Reily in this place. We shall speak of it, however, in another chapter. He left Philadelphia in May, 1825, and prosecuted the objects of his agency with remarkable success, and returned to this country in October of the following year. Wherever he went and had an opportunity to explain the object of his mission, he met with a generous reception and received liberal contributions. Publishers, booksellers, clergymen and learned professors gave of their books, so that the agent could scarcely find time to gather them all up; the wealthy gave their thalers; widows, hired servants and children their kreutzers; and the ladies their jewelry, their ear and finger rings, and one her gold watch. The Synod of Holland at its meeting gave 1000 guilders—about \$400—and more in the future, if in their power. He received during his trip in Holland, Germany and Switzerland \$6,669

in money and, about 5,000 volumes in books, mostly old, but many of them valuable in a theological library.

His Majesty the King of Holland and his Majesty the King of Prussia, who when boys had been taught the Heidelberg Catechism, took a deep interest in Mr. Reily's mission, and gave it their royal support. The former gave orders that all books which he should collect for the Seminary should leave his ports free of duty; the latter through his ministry gave him a royal sanction to take up collections throughout the Prussian monarchy, showing an example to his subjects by first making a contribution of 200 rix-dollars for himself and family. The following is a copy of a paper signed by one of his ministers allowing Mr. Reily to receive the gifts of his people for the Seminary within his dominions. The document is now sixty years old, and in a good state of preservation. The chirography could not be excelled in our day.

AUF ALLERHOESTE GENEHMIGUNG,

SEINER MAJESTAET DES KOENIGS,

*de dato den 8ten Juni, 1826.*

Wird dem ordinirten Prediger *James Reily*, der sich als Agent der Synode der deutsch reformirten Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten vollstaendig legitimirt hat, hierdurch die Erlaubniss ertheilt zur unterstuetzung des deutsch theologischen Seminars in gedachten Staaten milde Beitraege innerhalb der Preussischen Monarchie Sammeln, und die von dem Synodal Praeses, *Wilhelm Hendel* und dem Synodal Schreiber, *Lebrecht L. Hinsch* eigenhaendig, gezeichnete Aufforderung dazu. oeffentlich bekannt machen zu duerfen.

Berlin den 18ten Juni, 1826.

Ministerium der Geistlichen, Unterrichts, und Medizinal-Angelegenheiten.

ERLAUBNISSCHEIN

fuer den Prediger *James Reily* zur Sammlung milder Beitraege fuer das theologische Seminar der deutsch reformirten Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten.



To this document the seal of the King is affixed in which the following legend can still be read: *Fridericus Gulielmus Rex Borussorum. March. Brand. Summ. Sil. Dux et Com. Glac Dux. Rheni et Poscn Dux. Sax., etc.*

*Note.*—The following extract from an address delivered on a public occasion by the Rev. Dr. B. C. Wolff illustrates the inspiration by which Mr. Reily was moved to make his trip to Germany.

"It was at this crisis of affairs that it occurred to one of the friends of the Seminary that something might be done for the relief of the Seminary in the fatherland. That friend was the Rev. James Reily, then pastor of the Reformed congregation at Hagerstown, who inherited his zeal for the educational interests of the Church from his spiritual father and relative, the Rev. Dr. Hendel, and whose quick, energetic and practical turn of mind fitted him eminently for an agency of the kind. I can see him yet as he rode up to my father's door in Martinsburg, Va., where I happened to stand at the time. Springing from his fine horse to the pavement, he grasped me by the hand, and before he was done greeting me exclaimed, 'I am going to Germany!' 'But you are not on your way,' I replied. 'No,' he rejoined, 'but I soon will be: when we get into the house I will tell you.' We went in, and when he had laid aside his traveling gear and we were seated by the fire, he stated that on the way from Hagerstown (crossing the Potomac on a cold wintry day), it occurred to him, that if some one would visit Germany, where a deep interest had always been taken in the emigrant population of this country, a large amount of money and a library might be obtained for the Seminary. He was then on a visitation tour to the destitute congregations of the Shenandoah Valley. But when he returned, he would consult with his friends, and if they approved his purpose, he would procure the necessary testimonials of authority and make his arrangements to start as soon as possible. He did so, and was kindly received in Holland, Germany and Switzerland, and collected a considerable amount of money

and a large number of books, besides rendering important service to the Church and Seminary by cultivating the friendship of leading ministers of our Confession on the Continent, and making them acquainted with the condition and character of the German population of America."

*The Moral Effect.*—Mr. Reily had not been long in Europe before encouraging intelligence from him crossed the ocean, which continued until his return. This was just what was needed in the circumstances, and the effect upon the Seminary and its friends was very happy. It was manifestly the helping hand by which the vessel was guided in the dark night; and we cannot look upon it now but as a manifest interposition of divine Providence in cherishing a cause which at the time weak, if not contemptible, was destined to grow into important and valuable result in the years to come. The letters that follow will show their effect upon the mind of the professor, who was more inclined to look at the dark than the bright side of things.

## X

*York, Oct. 26, 1825.*

*B. C. Wolff, Esq.*—The dark clouds which have been so long overhanging our Church are broken and passing away, and a beautiful prospect is opening to us. Our little Seminary is prospering beyond my best hopes. In the Synod there is no opposition, and among our enemies there is silence and a calm, which, I trust, will only be interrupted by their own confession of error. The winter session will begin on next Wednesday with eight students, and several others will come on in the spring. I began with five, and in the latter half of the session had six. All these were indefatigable in their studies, and so far as I can observe, correct in their religious and moral deportment. I cannot say that all of them have experienced a change of heart, but I can say that all of them are hopeful, and every one of them will be discouraged from entering the ministry, if in the course of his studies, he does not give evidence of real piety.

There will soon be no want of books, and I have reason to believe, no want of money. Mr. Reily's success in Holland surpasses expectation. The Synod of Holland gave him 1000 guilders (\$400), and he has collected in Amsterdam above 1000 more, besides books, and was at the date of his last letter still going on prosperously in the same place. A copy of his letter will be forwarded to you by this or the next mail. If the Lord continues with him, as He has been, he will bring as much with him as will secure the permanency of the Seminary.

The Rev. Mr. Hendel has been appointed General Agent for this county with power to appoint sub-agents. I should be much pleased if you were willing to accept of a sub-agency, and to intimate your willingness to him. His residence is in Womelsdorf, Berks County. If a general effort is made in this county, I have little doubt that a handsome fund may be gathered.

Mr. Reily's mission to Europe opens an intercourse with learned and pious men there, and introduces us to the literature of that country. I have received a very kind letter from Dr. J. A. Lotze, a retired professor of divinity in Amsterdam, and an invitation to a friendly correspondence from Professor Van Hengel in the same place. I esteem these attentions, for many reasons, as very precious things, and hope to derive from the facilities which they furnish many important benefits; but I see at the same time with great regret, and with pain, that my feeble health precludes me from much of the profit and the pleasure which such a correspondence might afford.

Both the professors and the students at the Seminary in Princeton regard our infant institution with tenderness. The students make its prosperity a subject of prayer in their prayer-meetings, and are about to open a correspondence and to form a religious connection with our students. Several of them intend to offer their services to our Church, and one, at least, a young man, who understands the German language, will come to our Seminary in the spring to aid us during the summer session, and to improve his knowledge of the German, and

to identify himself with the German Church. You thus see there is no reason for despondency. God is evidently manifesting His mercy to us, and pointing out the way in which we shall find its richness. Our duty is to hope, to wait, to labor and to pray; all the rest may be and must be left to Him. I wish to live, but only in submission to the Lord's will until I can see the full light of the day which is dawning. If I am called away from my labors, a professor may be procured from Holland or Germany, without danger of deception through the kind offices of the pious and learned men with whom we are now forming an acquaintance. The Seminary will then suffer no very serious loss (if I am spared only a short time longer), and its business will be managed with much more effect by abler hands when I shall have gone, as I hope, to rest; but I shall not then see the brightness of our Lord's coming in our Zion. The Lord bless you and keep you all.

*Lewis Mayer.*

*Note.*—The Doctor was at this time suffering under a severe attack of *hepatitis*.—EDITOR.

## XI

*Carlisle April 14, 1826.*

————— Our Charter bill was lost in the lower House of Representatives, after it had passed the Senate. It was not taken up, although many attempts were made by its friends to bring it to a reading that an opportunity might be afforded to discuss its merits. If it had been acted upon at an early day of the session, like other private bills which had been reported in one of the two Houses, there would have been no considerable opposition; but there seems to be an indisposition to take up anything which concerns religion. Our bill, after being reported in the Senate, was therefore delayed until a late time of the session before it was called up and passed in that House. By this time our disaffected and perverse opponents had succeeded in raising a terrible uproar, and so frightened their poor representatives that they durst not vote for it, and they determined to smother it in the mass of unfinished business.

We were not apprized that it was necessary to have agents at Harrisburg to bore and goad the members, when it is wished to have any business done by the Legislature. If we had been aware of this fact we could have succeeded in the early part of the session: we were apprized of it when it was too late, and have been consequently defeated. We shall probably go to the Supreme Court, which will meet at Lancaster on the third Monday in May; but a charter obtained from this source will confine us to citizens of Pennsylvania, and will limit us in our annual income to £500.

From Mr. Reily I have letters dated at Heidelberg, November 18th, at Schaffhausen, December 29th, and at Basel, January 27th. The letters being in German, I could not have them copied. He was progressing in the object of his mission with great spirit and handsome encouragement from the ministry and people of the Reformed Church in every place. The Swiss in all their poverty received him very affectionately, and contributed their little with cheerful hearts. He is now, he says, certain that the interest of his collection will pay my salary. If the same success attends him in every other place, the amount will be very considerable. The collection of books is already such that he intends shipping some of them this spring. Among them are some very valuable works. He recommends a young man, a tutor in the Seminary at Basel, as a second professor. He represents him as truly learned, fervently pious, and unusually respected. This young man is willing to come at a moderate salary, until the circumstances of the Seminary shall enable the Synod to give him a better support. In conversation with one of the Trustees of the College here at Carlisle, I learned that the Board would without doubt give him an appointment in their institution, which would aid in supporting him. I shall, therefore, resign my situation in the College, and in that case he will be appointed professor of modern languages, or of something of a similar nature. I have no doubt that the Synod will call him unanimously, or nearly so. His appointment will conciliate the European

brethren in the Synod, and will gratify our generous and noble-minded friend in Europe; it will increase the respectability of our Seminary; make the institution more efficient; will exceedingly lighten my labors; and greatly enhance my comfort.

You thus see, my dear friend, what a door the Lord is opening to us, and what reason we have to hope for success in our efforts to improve our Church. All our exertions are directed to one great object, viz., to effect a radical change in the character of the ministry of the church by furnishing men of vital, fervent, zealous piety, and well instructed in the Holy Scriptures and the duties of the pastoral office. We cannot accomplish this at once; like every other work of God, it must be gradual, and must grow to perfection from a very small beginning. The course of instruction is designed to be biblical, not scholastic. Our principal book will be the Bible, and a constant eye will be kept upon the religious character of the students: nothing inconsistent with piety will be tolerated. The silly stories that circulate in the lower counties emanate from the most diabolical malice, and are kept in countenance by the most sottish ignorance. It is, however, true enough that young men, who profess to be students of divinity, but who were far enough away from a theological seminary in this country; that young lads, who were under the direction of private teachers, have spent their time in amusements and follies, which, to say the least, have done them no honor. Such lads would not bear our restrictions a single month; nor, indeed, would they have been condoned that long.

*Lewis Mayer.*

*No Union with the College.*—As stated in Dr. Mayer's letter, the Seminary had an humble beginning at Carlisle in the spring of 1825, but it made as much progress as could be expected under the circumstances. Extravagant expectations, however, had been raised which could not be realized at once, and the connection with the College did not work well. Only a few theological students presented themselves. The lecture-room for their accommodation was not satisfactory: few, or no college

students wished to be taught in German literature. The College was financially embarrassed, and Dr. Mayer was not willing that the trustees should pay the rent of his house, according to the engagement made at Bedford, without rendering an equivalent to the College in services, even if it had been offered to him, which probably was not the case. The marriage, therefore, was not consummated, or did not last long, if it was. The professor, accordingly, turned to the Synod of Frederick, in 1826, for his house rent, which was granted, and the Synod regarded itself as free to do as it might think best in regard to the future.

*A Substitute.*—The Rev. Mr. Ebauch felt that something might be done for the accommodation of the students, as well as to secure the permanent location of the institution at Carlisle, and he went to work in his own way to do what he could, to hold up the ark of the Lord. He accepted of an agency to collect funds for the Seminary in Cumberland County on certain conditions, which were, that four thousand dollars of the collections should be used for the erection of a new church and parsonage in a central part of the town, and that, in lieu of this, his old church, parsonage, and several lots should be presented to the Seminary for its use. Five members of the Board of Directors out of twelve, without claiming to be a quorum, sanctioned this proposition so far as they had any authority. The Consistory also did the same. Mr. Ebauch considered it in the light of a *solemn contract*! The Rev. Albert Helfenstein, of Baltimore, one of the five, wrote afterwards that, "They did not think they had any right to make a contract, because they were not a quorum of the Board. Their action was regarded only as advisory, which was left to the Synod to approve or reject." There was nothing wrong or improper in such an arrangement, and to most persons it would appear as if it might be of an advantage to both interests concerned. Unfortunately very different constructions were made of it, and it led to sad and disastrous results.

*An Entangling Alliance.*—When the Synod at Frederick dis-

claimed all obligations to retain the Seminary permanently at Carlisle, it ignored this so called contract altogether. Mr. Ebauch, as agent, had already secured over one thousand dollars in subscriptions and quite a number of books for the library, showing his energy and zeal in his work, but the Synod gave no countenance to his contract, and refused to commit itself in any way to Carlisle as a permanent location for the Seminary.

When the Carlisle Consistory learned the mind of the Synod, that it was unwilling to bind itself forever to Carlisle, with some feelings of disappointment, they requested their pastor to give up his contract and confine himself from that time onward to his pastoral duties. That was wise, and if that advice had been adhered to, it would have saved them, their pastor, and the entire Church, a deluge of trouble.

But the Carlisle pastor was enthusiastic, irrepressible, full of fire, and was, no doubt, convinced in his own mind that he could carry out his plan. The Synod had not approved of it, but it had not in so many words condemned it. After some reflection and consultation with those who were not wise counselors, he went to work again on his contract, (?) doubtless believing that in some way the Seminary could be kept at Carlisle, and then matters would all come out right.

The old church, under the direction of the pastor, underwent some changes, and the Seminary was allowed the use of it as a lecture-room. It became more suitable for theological lectures than any of the lecture-rooms in the college, which were exposed to the pranks of boisterous students. Contrary to the advice and expostulation of the professor of theology, Mr. Ebauch went forward with his new church, purchased material and commenced to build in an eligible part of the town. In this he most probably overpowered his consistory, just as he, no doubt, thought he could overpower the Seminary and the Synod, and perhaps the world itself. The result was what usually happens when an individual does not sit down, before he commences to build, and carefully count the cost. It turned out that the bills could not be paid; the fine building, nearly



or quite finished, had to be sold at a sacrifice. It was purchased by the Methodists, and still stands a conspicuous building in the front street of the town. As this seemed to involve financial ruin, all the energies of the pastor were called into requisition to avert the gathering storm. He had sympathizing friends, some of whom were doubtless extemporized and brought into line by his vivid imagination and strong will.

*Complications.*—It was thought that as the Seminary had become connected with the building of the new church, it might be used to overcome the difficulties that had been created. It was important therefore that in some way it should be permanently located at Carlisle. That point being once secured, the breakers which were ahead might be avoided and the remainder of the voyage would, it was no doubt hoped, be comparatively plane sailing. It was easy to see that the Seminary had a large constituency, and it was believed that it had also a broad back, which, even if it had its own heavy burdens to bear, might nevertheless bear a part of the burdens of others also.

*Lawyers come in.*—The Synod, regarding itself free from its obligations to the College at Carlisle, persistently refused to be bound to the place, and preferred to maintain its freedom of action. But it was thought that what could not be secured by Synodical action might be reached indirectly through the new charter for the Seminary about to be obtained from the legislature. From this time forward the Carlisle pastor was evidently in the hands of lawyers, who showed their ability in magnifying technical points, without much regard for justice or honor. They displayed more than usual tact in promoting the supposed interests of their client, but it would have been much better in the end if he had left himself in the hands of the Synod, and listened to the advice of the elders in the church.

*Synod seeks to get a Charter.*—At the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1825, a committee was appointed to procure a charter from the Legislature of Pennsylvania. Such an instrument was prepared, which defined carefully the relation of the Synod to the Seminary, and was entirely satisfactory; but after it had passed

the Senate it could not be brought into the House, and was allowed to slumber in the hands of the committee. This was owing to the fact that some enemies of the Seminary instructed their representatives to oppose the bill, as a bill which gave too much power to a Synod; and they being in a quandary, not being willing to vote for it or against it, adopted the alternative of smothering it in the committee room. Dr. Mayer naively remarks in one of his letters that, "We were not apprized that it was necessary to have agents at Harrisburg to bore and goad the members when we wished to have any business done by the Legislature. If we had been aware of this fact, we could have succeeded in the early part of the session, and consequently we have been defeated."

*Note.*—A similar state of things existed in the Legislature of Pennsylvania when the bill for the consolidation of Franklin and Marshall College came up before it in the winter of 1850. It was understood that obstacles might be covertly thrown in the way of its passage, so as to secure its defeat in a quiet way. But Dr. Nevin was duly apprized of this fact, and he was on the ground in due time. Some of the members had not studied the bill, but were under the impression that money would be employed to get it through the Legislature. But when the Doctor explained to them its nature and informed them that it was not a money-making but a purely benevolent and philanthropic measure, they showed their intelligence and gave it their cordial support, and there was no further difficulty. A nettle is best disposed of by just taking it into the hand and crushing it at once.

*Instead of Bread Synod gets a Stone.*—When the Synod of Frederick learned the ways of the Legislature, as it had no silver or gold to offer in the way of subsidies, it appointed a committee of five gentlemen of standing in the State to assist the Board of Directors in getting the smothered charter through the House during the winter of 1826-27. They finding the old difficulty rather unyielding, and perhaps out of patience with the business of lobbying, put the matter in the hands of

Mr. Ebauch, then agent of the Seminary. He was soon on the ground, and it was not long before he secured a charter. Finding the servants of the people stolid to his appeals—if he made any at all—he cut the matter short, amended the bill, omitted all its ecclesiastical features, appealed to the Supreme Court, and obtained a charter—just such a one as suited him best. He was of the opinion that the Board had discretionary powers, which he could use when necessary; and he evidently did use them.

In the charter thus secured all those articles which gave the Synod the absolute control of the Seminary, its property and of the election of professors, were erased. This omission by implication left important Synodical duties in the hands of the corporation. It was at least susceptible of this construction, and certain astute lawyers might give it that interpretation in an emergency—if it should happen to serve their purpose.

*Tries again to get a Charter.*—The Synod which met in York, in 1827, noticed with surprise the omissions, and rejected the instrument at once. It also insisted on the restoration of the articles that had been omitted, an omission which left to the Trustees such large discretionary powers, and made them in fact a close corporation. And now, to make the question of location still clearer, it amended the old charter, which it had approved, by making it read, “at present located” at Carlisle, instead of merely “located.”

*A Peace Measure.*—The Synod allowed the old Board of Directors to remain as the representatives of the Synod, to look after the affairs of the Seminary, but with no authority to act as a corporate body. They were to remain in office until a new charter could be secured. It was a peace measure, and it was no doubt supposed that it would be superseded at no distant day by a legal board or corporation. But such was not the case, which the Synod found out to its great sorrow. Had the brethren been less trustful and confiding, they would have most assuredly appointed a new Board, or materially reconstructed the old, as the sequel will show.

*Another Failure.*—After the Synod at York, in 1827, had settled all the disputed points in regard to the kind of charter required, a committee, of which J. R. Reily was chairman, was appointed to apply to the Legislature—not the Supreme Court—for such a charter as the Synod required. Mr. Reily would, no doubt, have obtained what the Synod wanted without delay, if he had been sustained by all the members of the committee; but there was one member on the jury who prevented a verdict, and Mr. Reily, to his own mortification, had to report at the Synod of Mifflinburg, in 1828, that nothing had been done. It established the fact that there was at least one man in the Synod who had a will in harmony with the Synod strong enough to resist another will adverse to the Synod, backed by determined lawyers.

*Resolves to make a Third Effort.*—The Synod, getting its eyes further opened so as to take in the situation, appointed a committee of five to take charge of the property belonging to the Seminary, and instructed them to pay out no moneys unless by its own order and instruction. The committee on the charter was reconstructed with Mr. Reily still as chairman, and again instructed to obtain the act of incorporation at the next meeting of the Legislature.

This action of the Synod—easily understood—was resisted by Mr. Ebaugh, and he entered upon its minutes his solemn protest, as a violation of his contract—something purely visionary—as well as that of the College at Carlisle—also visionary. As he could best understand, it would seriously interfere with his financial arrangements; and it would also interfere with his long-cherished dream of making the Seminary large and prosperous at Carlisle. It seems that he had no doubt of this in his own mind. He knew of a prominent member of the Church, a man of means and imposing name, who would give ten thousand acres of land for the endowment of the Seminary in case it was incorporated and permanently located at Carlisle. How this was, nobody knew; but he doubtless believed in it himself. He was an enthusiast, and looked forward to the time when

Carlisle would be the centre of the Church. The decided course which the Synod took was a severe blow to his air-castles, and it is said that he wept like a child.

*A Third Failure.*—At the Synod of Lebanon, in 1829, the Directors had to report again, "That on account of obstacles put in their way, they had not been able to effect the object of their appointment." "The Rev. Mr. Ebaugh read a statement in vindication of himself and his friends, which was replied to by Mr. Reily, a member of the committee, and the Rev. Dr. Mayer." Thereupon the Synod, fully aroused and laying aside some of its old-fashioned, Pennsylvania good nature, asserted something of its slumbering Calvinistic vim. It took up the charter of the Seminary, ordered a draft to be prepared by a committee on the ground, had it read paragraph by paragraph, amended it, and adopted it as a whole. "Thereupon it was resolved that a committee be appointed to lay the charter before the Legislature once more for its sanction." The committee consisted of Professor Mayer, Rev. J. R. Reily, Dr. Luther Reily and Messrs. John C. Bucher and George Misch.

"The Synod then proceeded to the election of Trustees to be named in the charter. The following gentlemen were chosen: Jacob Laucks, George Small, John Hartman, John Evans, Esq., Martin Danner, William Wagner, Samuel Wagner, George Hoke, George King, John Zeller, William D. Gobrecht, Daniel Schnebly, Dr. John B. Misch, Dr. John W. Gloninger, Dr. Luther Reily, William Heyser, John Schley and John Dieffenderfer.

"The following gentlemen were elected as members of the Board of Visitors: Rev. Messrs. James R. Reily, H. B. Schaffner, F. W. Vandersloot, Albert Helfenstein, Sr., J. C. Becker, J. W. Dechant, F. A. Rahausser, Jacob Geiger, Martin Brunner, Jacob Mayer, Jacob Beecher and Y. H. Fries."

*A Fourth Failure.*—At the meeting of the Synod at Hagerstown, Md., in 1830, the Directors reported that they had discharged their duties according to the provisions of the charter, that prejudice against theological schools was gradually passing

away (some having regarded the Reformed Seminary as dangerous to the liberties of the people as the United States Bank itself), and that the prospects of the Seminary were encouraging. But the charter had not yet received any legal sanction at Harrisburg or elsewhere, whereupon the Synod passed one more resolution to secure a Freibrief or charter.

*The Fifth Effort crowned with Success.*—At the annual meeting of the Synod of Harrisburg in 1831, the Trustees of the Seminary reported that the wishes of the Synod had been carried out, that the charter, as approved at its previous meeting, had been sanctioned by the Supreme Court and Executive of the State of Pennsylvania; that they were acting as an incorporated body, and had received into their hands all the moneys and property of the institution. The charter was short, well-guarded in all of its points, and required no amendments until a few years ago, when it needed some enlargement to suit the times; among other things, to authorize an increase in the income of the Board.

The efforts, extending over five or six years, to secure a fundamental law which would enable the Church to control an institution of its own according to law, instead of leaving it to individuals who wished to run it themselves, encountered difficulties of which we, in our day, can scarcely form any conception. It was a conflict between Church and State on a small scale. Some worthy people thought it was giving the Church too much power, and some politicians in the Legislature encouraged and supported this kind of prejudice. Such ideas have not died out altogether, it seems, in our day. They are the echoes of a dreary past when the Church and State could not understand each other.

*The Pseudo-Charter.*—The long delay in settling the charter question was, however, turned to bad account by misguided men under bad legal advisers, which led to complications of a sad and distressing character. The charter obtained in the year 1827 was, of course, a dead letter when it was rejected by the Synod; but as the Directors named in this charter were

retained in office as Director or representatives of the Synod, the charter, as a legal document, came to acquire a certain degree of vitality. The large majority of the Trustees eschewed all right to act in any way under what was now a surreptitious charter; but a meeting of a few, whether a quorum or not, whether regular or irregular—a sort of rump parliament on a small scale—could be convened at any time, and resolutions passed, which the President, Dr. Luther Reily, of Harrisburg, said had no more force than so much child's play.

*A Note.*—Owing to the confusion and uncertainty prevalent when Mr. Reily returned from Europe, after the meeting of Synod in 1826, he was at a loss to know what to do with the moneys and books that he had brought with him. Some of the Board of Directors of the Seminary seemed anxious to receive both; but Mr. Reily, following safe counsellors, retained them in his own name until he could hand them over to a legal or responsible Board. This subjected him to misrepresentations, and at the right time he gave “the following facts to the public, so that every one might be able to judge for himself.”

“The Library, or the greater part of it, was collected by me in Europe, and brought to this country in 1826. I found, on my arrival in this country, that there existed considerable dissatisfaction among the members of the Synod with some of the members of the Board of Directors, who had obtained a charter in an improper manner, and I was consequently cautious not to surrender up these books to the Trustees under that charter. I gave the books to Professor Mayer for the use of the Seminary until such time as Synod should decide upon the matter. The Synod decided afterwards that I should retain the books until a charter could be obtained. The charter was secured at last, and a Board of Trustees appointed by Synod, and regularly organized. To this Board I gave up the books and money which I had collected in Europe, and I made a final settlement with them in 1829, and paid over the money with interest from the time I arrived in this country until it

was paid over to the Treasurer of the Board of Trustees, which the proceedings of the Board will show."

Mr. Reily made this statement some time before the charter adopted by the Synod received a legal sanction; but the Board had been reconstructed, and it was now considered safe to make the transfer. It would have been better to have waited several years longer. It would then have baffled the sheriff of Cumberland County and the lawyers, as we shall see in another place, who were anxious to pounce upon the Library at Carlisle, but could not make out their case—just at that time.

*A Legal Fiction.*—At one of these meetings the members present under the pseudo-charter gave Mr. Ebauch a judgment bond for \$2,024 against the Seminary for the losses he had sustained in building his new church, which was sold by the sheriff at less than what it had cost. Under the advice of the shrewd lawyers into whose hands he had committed himself, hand and foot, the judgment was placed in the hands of the sheriff, with instructions to levy on any property which the Seminary held that would be sufficient to satisfy the judgment bond. The old church, the parsonage and the three lots were sold as the property of the Seminary, for which it had never received any deeds or papers, because it was regarded as such, constructively, by the lawyers. The property, said to be worth seven or eight thousand dollars by Mr. Ebauch in his former enthused state of mind, unfortunately sold for only \$1,500, and so the sheriff was duly authorized to get the balance out of any other property the Seminary might hold, for instance, in its books. But the Library was not transferred as yet to the Seminary, as Mr. Reily held on to it by a firm grip, according to the instructions of Synod, and so the sheriff did not lay hands on it at Carlisle.

*A Note.*—The facts given above are taken from "*Eine Geschichte des Theologischen Seminars des Deutsch Reformirten Kirchen in den vereinigten Staaten*," published in the year 1831, in pamphlet form, pp. 64. We are indebted, for the pe-



rusal of a copy, to Rev. J. C. Bucher, D.D., of Lewisburg, Pa., who was a student at Carlisle during the times of these trials. It was called forth by misrepresentations of the Church, the Seminary and its professor, that were circulated on the street and through the public press, thick as leaves on a windy day in autumn. The authorship was anonymous; but the writer—not a member of the Church or of any of its Boards—was an able lawyer, astute, shrewd and strong in speech, who hurled shot and shell into the camp of the lawyers on the other side with their unfortunate client under their arms, that burned as they flew, and demolished their fortress of technical points, when they imagined they could stand against the world. The simple statement of truth, like the touch of Ithuriel's spear, dissolved the baseless structure of legal presuppositions. With these explanatory statements, we now lay before our readers the remaining letters of Dr. Mayer during the sojourn of the Seminary in the wilderness at Carlisle.

## XII

*Carlisle, March 27, 1827.*

*B. C. Wolff, Esq.*—I labor here with a slow, painful progress. The number of our students is only eight, and none of them is distinguished for talents or acquirements. The Seminary is neglected by its professed friends. The situation resembles that of a little barque on a rough sea, with a pilot, indeed, and a compass on board, but without sails or seamen to manage them, tossed by the winds and waves, in constant danger of being dashed upon quicksands or rocks, ever and anon addressed by a passing vessel under easy sail, that hails her, asks her how she does, wishes her a pleasant voyage and bears away. I shall not abandon this suffering ship until I discover that she is sinking, which I hope and pray may not be.

*Lewis Mayer.*

## XIII

*Carlisle, October 27, 1828.*

---

— We are going on in hope and faith, not by sight. My course is a continued conflict with difficulties and

discouragements, which have often brought me to the verge of despair; but though many desponding words have escaped me, I have not yet been suffered to sink; some word of encouragement from a friend or some exhortation to faithfulness and perseverance has more than once lifted up the hands that hung down and strengthened the feeble knees. It often happens in critical moments that the result of most important measures depends upon extremely slight causes. A word may be so timed that its consequences may involve the fate of millions and extend to eternity; and its intervention at the critical moment may appear merely accidental, and until then its occurrence may have been in the highest degree improbable. It is often the case, too, that the agents themselves in these transactions are utterly unconscious of the importance of their acts. Yet this is no more than the ordinary providence of God, and every event is certain to Him. I am in no doubt about the accomplishment of God's purposes, but I cannot yet see what that purpose is, and I often apprehend that the prosperity of our Church is not involved in it. I have frequent experiences of His goodness, sometimes unusual refreshings and growing confidence. At this time my hope is somewhat strengthened, at other times I am like the reed in a storm. May God support me and make me instrumental in doing some good.

My health has been unexpectedly improved and I have hope that it will continue during the coming season. My preservation so far has frequently surprised me, and now awakens anew the idea which often arose in my childhood, moved me to many undertakings and has never quite forsaken me, that God has some special work for me to do. It may be a mere conceit, and it has been less cherished in my riper years than it was in my youth, yet it has supported my hope of safety in some trying situations, has urged me to some of my difficult undertakings, and in the midst of desponding thoughts has more than once rebuked despair. If it is a delusion, it has done me some service, and at this time makes me feel greater nearness to God. I am taught at the same time by many painful expe-

riences how entirely a good work is the work of God. The disappointments and reverses we have suffered have been so similar to those which have marked the course of other benevolent enterprises, that I take some comfort from them. The history of Protestant missions among the heathen, which were remarkable for their success at later periods, were as remarkable for their reverses in their earlier years. The most important events, too, which have blessed the earth, sprang from small beginnings, which were at first despised. Christianity had its birth-place in a manger, and the Reformation originated with an obscure monk. Such are my reflections, and such my consolations, when God enables me to rise from the dust. He sends relief to me by sending me some friend to revive the drooping spirit, and to turn the current of thought into another channel.

My pecuniary difficulties still continue. The feeling excited here by the Synod's rejection of the charter was confined to a few, and seems to have subsided. I think, therefore, that we shall have no further trouble on that account. The editing of the Magazine will pass into the hands of the Rev. Daniel Young, whose answer I have just received. The German work will be edited by the Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, of Philadelphia, or for him. For editing the English one Mr. Young will receive \$300. But to enable us to pay his salary the subscription will have to be raised to 600 copies. For 800 we must pay \$550. We shall print no more than 700 copies of the second volume, perhaps less. For these we may have to pay \$475 or \$500. Six hundred subscriptions amount nominally to \$900, but really to about \$850. From this we must deduct postage and other contingencies, from thirty to fifty dollars. In the first year the loss was greater than it will be hereafter, because having no subscription of any note when we began, we sent many copies to individuals from whom nothing will be received. The subscription, rated at present at 500 copies, does not amount to that number of responsible subscribers. I have learned by mortifying experience that men's professions of willingness to aid in a cause are not always worthy of confidence.

Some very wealthy members of our Church have refused to take the Magazine, and some of the numbers sent them have been lost, and the volumes to which they belonged broken and rendered useless. I hope some further exertion will be made in your place to increase the circulation. It will hereafter be more interesting, I presume, than it has been. From various sources I have been greeted with censures. Please take the following as a specimen of the spirit of some of them, in reference to the Magazine. Its literary character however is a unique, a *sui generis*. "Sir! Permit me! It appears to me, and others that the professorship in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church would Receive much more Cirden Support by omitting such simple Obligations as the one which you will find in (No) 10 Page 313 Under-Since by one gentleman Jacob Myers, this obligation, as of a welthy and liberal man; who exposes his liberality On such Conditions, that one Hundred Persons shall follow his Example: yes this very simple thing has been the Cause of Laughter by many—the Subscribers Pay for and wish Reasonable Matter: I remain yours, &c ———." This letter is from a clergyman of our Church who sustained an examination by a committee (of course in his own language, the German.—EDITOR.) It is copied verbatim et literatim et punctuatim. It is not a capital letter, yet not wanting in capitals. I have replied to the writer for the purpose of preventing the mischief his ignorance and vanity might do to our cause.

*Lewis Mayer.*

*A Note.*—The writer of the above laconic epistle was a warm and earnest preacher of the Gospel in his own way, in the German language, but averse to novelties, and the proposition of Elder Myers, of Virginia, proposing to raise \$10,000 to endow the Seminary at Carlisle, was to him something unheard of and too much for his comprehension at the time. As a further illustration of the progress of the English language in some parts of Pennsylvania thirty years ago, as well as of the progress in reform, we here give a copy of the action adopted at a tem-

perance meeting held in one of the townships of Lancaster County December, 1851, and now on file in the Quarter Sessions office at Lancaster, Pa. It may help the temperance cause. It is given in the language in which it was addressed to the Honorable Court :

“Consideration of the Neberhood of — township, Lancaster County, December 26th, 1851, about morality temberense & Religions,

“1. Resol’n that — made an aplication for a publig Hous in our neberhood for instans we have five publig housses on our small township an one in the neberhood, three on the Swamp and travelers is very few of strengers.

“2. Resol’n that the aplicand is near the church and meting hous and it was alrety drunken feller on meetings and made Disturbens and the taverns is about one meil of.

“3. Resol’n that about eighteen years back we hat a publick Hous very near by the Ablicand and it was a great trubel for the neberhood about trunkers and Disturbens.

“4. Resol’n that we understand that the Aplicand has a back patition we know there is many single men and with families in the patition, Some will suner go to the tavern as to the mill, wife and chilter has no bred.”

#### XIV

*Carlisle, July 25, 1829.*

---

Your letter has been some time on hand, because it is seldom in my power to write a letter. Though the number of students is very small, I have more labor than my feeble health enables me to bear. I am engaged in the morning at study until ten o'clock; from ten to twelve, I have recitations with a class of only three students; from twelve to two I dine, and, if not prevented by other business, hear the recitations of my three daughters, whom, for want of means, I educate at home; from two to four, I attend to a young man sent from North Carolina, without means, without education, and without talents, whom I cannot and dare not send away; from five to seven, I devote

to exercise, generally on horseback ; from seven to ten, I attend to study, if I am able to do anything at all. My students occupy more than they ought of my time, because they have no culture, and are for the most part of ordinary capacity.

Since the middle of May, Mr. Young has been absent on a visit to his friends in the State of New York, and the editing of the Magazine has been upon my hands. He was taken very ill after his arrival at Scotchtown, Orange County, New York, where his mother resides. I have not heard from him for the last three weeks. In addition to these employments, I have the whole care of protecting the Synod's library, and of watching and resisting the plans of the party, who leave nothing untried to get the property and the funds of the Seminary into their power. The detestable party calling themselves the Board of Directors, consisting of — and his church members, aided by a few pliant tools, admitted a claim of the congregation for indemnity, amounting to more than \$2,000, founded on Ebaugh's failure to fulfill his engagements to them for a new church and parsonage as the agent of the same Board, and gave to the vestry, that is, to themselves, a judgment bond on the property belonging to the Seminary. The vestry has since taken out an execution, which is in the sheriff's hands, and he waits only for an opportunity to levy it on the Seminary. I have the keys, and claim the property in trust for the Synod, and have informed the prowlers that I shall resist them by all means in my power. To be prepared for the crisis, I am collecting information and testimony and have employed an attorney. As soon as the sheriff attempts to levy, I shall sue him for trespass. Attempts have been recently made (before I knew that an execution had been issued) to get the keys from me under the pretext that the intention was only to show the library to some strangers who were here, and they should be returned. After the third application, when the explanation of the object was first given, I went with the last applicant, —, opened the library, admitted the strangers (Lutheran clergymen), closed it again, and retained the keys. I took that occasion to inform

Mr. — fully of the manner in which I viewed their disgraceful proceedings, my utter loss of confidence in them, the measures I had taken and my determination to persist in them. He bore this with great moderation, and we parted in a friendly manner. Since that time the party have treated me with a show of much friendship, and lately the most hostile member of it has assumed a most friendly demeanor. I did not know what all this meant, suspected that it might be a *ruse de guerre*, but was more inclined to believe that it proceeded from a determination to give up the contest. But only three days ago I discovered that an execution had been issued, and then began to see that all this outward friendliness was designed only to recover my confidence and to get possession of the keys. What detestable hypocrisy! I have constant anxiety and distress from this cause, and have not a soul in this place to whom I can pour out my griefs, and from whom consolation can be obtained, because I know not in whom to confide; neither do I receive aid from any friend of the Seminary. At a distance other causes of grief arise. The spirit of the late meetings in Lancaster, Berks, and Philadelphia counties in opposition to all religious activity prevails with great violence among the ignorant and the vicious of that region, and preachers have abandoned the ground to the enemy. Mr. — is creating new troubles. He attempted to effect a separation of his Classis from the Synod. He has withdrawn from the Seminary a young man, formerly a student of his, who had spent in all about fifteen months, was beginning to give some promise, was pledged to continue his studies here until next fall, and received from the Synod's fund an appropriation of \$80 for the year. Mr. Hendel, in Carlisle, was constituted the depository of the educational funds. I had obtained from him a promise that no more than half the appropriation shall be given to any student during the first session in the year. But I have learned that he permitted the young man to draw the whole upon the plea that having suffered a loss, being consequently in debt for the preceding session, he was in want. Three of the students who

are here are sickly. There are but four in all. One who spent six months here was permitted on account of utter incapacity to withdraw. We have open enemies and, I fear, some false brethren to harm us. Consider, my dear friend, what my feelings are. I am often upon the verge of despair, and am saved only by some favorable occurrence, which appears as an interposition of Divine mercy. I hope none will add to my distress by forsaking the cause in our extremity. What God may do, I know not; but hoping still for the best, I shall endeavor to keep my post, and I entreat all others who are the friends of Christ and of His Church to help me. Everything is expected from me, but none come to my aid.

I have purchased a large dwelling-house with seven half lots of ground, formerly the ——. *Cætera desunt.*

*Progress at Carlisle.*—But, notwithstanding this sad letter, the Seminary at Carlisle had been growing in strength all the while, with its manifold trials and tribulations. It was gaining the confidence of the Church, which ministered to its wants with gifts when its treasury was empty. In what seemed to be its darkest hour—in the year 1828—a plan was originated in the professor's old charge in Virginia, and carried out by Rev. Jacob Beecher, his successor at Shepherdstown and Martinsburg, by which \$10,000 were raised in \$100 subscriptions for its endowment. The contributors represented a wide constituency in the Church, and although a part of the whole amount was lost through the protests of the bad spirit, *Der stehts verneint*, yet enough of it came into the treasury to strengthen the opposite and better spirit that was extending itself in all the churches.

*The Magazine.*—In November, 1827, the Missionary Society established the *German Reformed Magazine*, and requested Dr. Mayer to edit it for the benefit of the Seminary, of missions, of beneficiary education and of every good work and word. The institution thus obtained an organ through which the intelligence and piety of the Church could be addressed once a month in its own behalf. It was a right arm of strength to it in times



when members of the Church found it often difficult to distinguish the truth from idle rumors or wilful misrepresentations.

*Life and Fruits.*—The course of study in the Seminary, as the professor says, was imperfect; but the spiritual training which the students received made up, in a large degree, for the deficiency in that which was more intellectual. The following ministers commenced, and most of them finished, their studies at Carlisle: Henry Wagner, J. G. Fritschey, J. H. Crawford, J. C. Bucher, Daniel Zacharias, G. A. Shook, J. F. Dieffenbacher, Jacob Leymeister, Jonathan Zeller, D. B. Lerch, G. A. Leopold, Henry S. Bassler and Daniel Ziegler. The Carlisle students, as they used to be called, did honor to their *Alma Mater*, and were among the most faithful and efficient pastors of the Church. Dr. J. C. Bucher, of Lewisburg, Pa., is the only one of the number still with us, over eighty years of age, enjoying the sunset of life, after a long and useful career in the ministry.

*The Removal to York.*—It was, perhaps, unfortunate that the Seminary was not permitted to pursue its useful and beneficent career at Carlisle without molestation. Had it remained there a few years longer, under proper management and direction, it would most likely have fallen heir to Dickinson College, with its property, when its Trustees, no longer able to sustain it, gave it away, just as it stood, to another denomination, provided they would keep it up as a respectable college. The Seminary, however, was never allowed to take root at Carlisle.

"On my return to this country in November 1826," says Mr. Reily, "I passed through Carlisle, and remained a day there. A general complaint, by the Professor and seven out of the eight students, was made of the treatment received in Carlisle, and a desire expressed to have the Seminary removed to some other place. I met with Messrs. Ebaugh and McClelland at the house of the latter, and in the course of the conversation the dissatisfaction of the Professor and the misunderstanding existing between him and some of the Trustees of Dickinson College were mentioned. Professor McClelland gave an ex-

planation, and I said, "The best way would be to remove and thereby end all strife." Mr. Ebaugh said in reply, 'That the Synod could not remove, that it had made a contract with the Trustees of Dickinson College.' I left Carlisle and went on to Baltimore, and had all the books sent on to Carlisle. On my arrival at Carlisle, a second time, the Professor read a letter from the Rev. Dr. Cathcart, of York, suggesting the propriety of locating the Seminary at that place, and assigning some reasons for it and the probability of getting a considerable sum subscribed at York for the Seminary. The Professor expressed his willingness to move if the Synod should so direct."

From what has already been said, and from the statements made in Dr. Mayer's letters, the difficulties at Carlisle, already beginning in 1826, only increased from that time onward, until they became of a very grave character. Accordingly, at the Synod of Lebanon, in 1829, there seemed to be no other alternative but to "remove the Seminary, and thereby end the strife," and so it was removed to York without delay. The removal took place, but it did not end the strife. For a while it only increased it.

This chapter in Seminary history has grown on our hands to an unusual length for the columns of this periodical, and yet we have not written out an important part of what properly pertains to the "Beginnings" of the history which we are here seeking to reproduce. One more chapter, giving an account of the difficulties and trials which awaited the Seminary at York, will exhaust, as we hope, the subject. This will appear in connection with what we have already written, in pamphlet form of perhaps a hundred pages, which we expect to publish in the near future, with the hope that it may receive a wider circulation in the Church, especially among the membership. The whole history should be of great interest to every member of the Reformed Church. It illustrates the guiding hand of Providence as it led our fathers through a howling wilderness to a better land. It speaks of the things that should be told to the generations following.

#### IV.

### THE SCOPE OF SCIENCE.

BY PROF. JOHN S. STAHR, PH.D.

THE impulse to know or to understand, which is implanted in the very constitution of man, is one of the noblest attributes of his being. We are sometimes told that it was the tree of knowledge in Paradise that threatened the peace of man's primitive state and ultimately destroyed it; but the statement is false, and rests upon a false assumption. It was not the tree of knowledge, but of the *experimental knowledge of good and evil*, that was forbidden, and the path of transgression, not the effort to acquire knowledge, led to the door where the flood-gates of misery were opened. In any case, no matter what course human development would have taken, knowledge of the world was the condition without which that subjugation of the earth for which the Creator designed man would have been impossible. If man is "a harp of a thousand strings" which responds to the touches of nature and gives birth to harmonious strains of feeling or sensibility; if he is lord over the earth, laying his hand upon land and sea to compel the forces of nature to do his will, he is also the microcosm within which the great world without is made to exist again in the light of consciousness—a clear mirror from which God's thoughts are reflected in the form of knowledge as divine light in the soul. Indeed, in the trinity of man's nature, the reason, although not the highest, is the central faculty through which the others, in large measure, must act, and by which alone their activity can be perfected. The desire for knowledge is, therefore, not only legitimate; it is also, like hope in Pandora's box, in the limitations of human

existence and under the pressure of countless ills, man's sweet solace and guiding star. Knowledge itself is ennobling, and, in a degree, purifying; the striving after knowledge is still more so, and we can understand, accordingly, why Lessing laid such stress upon it. "If the Almighty," he says, "were to hold out both hands toward me, the possession of absolute truth in the right hand, and the search for truth in the left, and bid me choose which I would have, I would at once seize the left hand and say: 'Give, O Father! The possession of absolute truth is for Thee alone!'"

The acquisition of knowledge opens the way for that human interest which we call science—an interest which springs from the marriage of the human spirit with nature or the objective world. These two terms, nature and the objective world, are often used as if they were synonymous; but they have not precisely the same meaning. The latter is broader and includes more than the former, and the field of science, therefore, is also different according as we use one or the other of the two terms. The former is the one generally used, and science, accordingly, becomes natural science in the broad sense of the word, or the science of nature. But it is important to remember that, unless nature be regarded in a broader light than is usually done, many interests will be excluded which may readily be made the object of human investigation, and, accordingly, of science. There is a science of history, a science of language, a science of morality, and, on the basis of divine revelation, a science of theology. Yea, mind itself may become the object of investigation, the human spirit may be subject and object at the same time, and thus give rise to the science of mind or psychology. All these objects of human thought may be said to belong to the objective world, and simply because they are objective, and in the degree in which they are objective to the mind, do they enter the domain of knowledge, and constitute the matter or contents of science.

Knowledge is not necessarily science. Men may learn a great deal in their particular walks in life, and yet not have that

broad, comprehensive grasp of things which constitutes science. The patriarch Jacob, for instance, when he was tending the flocks of his father-in-law, Laban, knew a good deal about heredity, variation and the influence of environment, and he did not scruple to use the knowledge which he possessed. Farmers and gardeners, by observation and experiment, have learned many curious facts concerning the habits and behaviour of plants and animals, and their variation under domestication, and they have turned these facts to good account in their respective fields of labor. But it was not until Charles Darwin, with wonderful industry and patience, collected facts from every department of nature and combined them with marvelous skill, so as to lead step by step to certain broad generalizations and underlying principles, that the scientific world learned to see of what wonderful import these facts really are. Although men differ widely in their judgment of Darwin's conclusions and the extent to which the development of nature is affected by the forces to which he called attention, there is no denying that the publication of "The Origin of Species" in 1859 marks an epoch in the history of science, and that its influence is felt in every scientific investigation of the day. To constitute science, therefore, knowledge must extend over a wide field; it must be systematically arranged so as to form a unit; it must proceed by wide induction from outward phenomena to general principles, which in turn become the basis of inference or of deductive knowledge.

On the other hand, it is evident that *system* does not constitute science. It is possible to take assumed facts as the basis of inference, or to combine real facts with false principles and then build up a beautiful system, which is paraded before the world under the usurped name of science. We may name as examples of this kind the so-called sciences of astrology, alchemy and phrenology, each of which rested upon principles which possessed a certain measure of truth, but were nevertheless false in the way in which they were apprehended. Facts and principles were assumed, or accepted as inferences by in-

duction from too narrow premises. Accordingly, notwithstanding the beauty and symmetry of the systems, the genius displayed in their elaboration, and the precious truths discovered by adepts in their researches, modern science only laughs at the vagaries of these earlier days. Science cannot make its own data. These are God-given, ready made, at hand in nature, produced in the unfolding of human life, or welling up in the consciousness of man—things, facts, or ideas which the mind apprehends, and, as cognitions, arranges and disposes so as to hold them in their true relation to each other and to their underlying principles.

The true test of science is its prescience or prophetic power. If the general principle, reached by induction, is correct, it must apply to all the particular cases that arise under it. In this way every discovery made, every new generalization, must open the way to new applications, and on the basis of previous knowledge the *savant* is often able to foretell the result of new and untried combinations or causes, just as by reasoning backward from effect to condition, Leverrier inferred the existence of a new planet from the perturbations of known planets in their orbits, and Bunsen the existence of a new metal from the presence of certain lines in the spectra obtained from mineral waters at Dürkheim, in Germany. Here the line must be drawn between speculation or hypothesis and true science. However valuable and important speculation and hypothesis may be in scientific investigation, they have no scientific weight whatever until they lead to results which can be weighed or measured, or the correctness of which can be exactly demonstrated.

One of the chief characteristics of the age in which we live is the extent of its scientific development. It is the boast and glory of our day that scientific investigation is now placed on a firm and sure foundation, and that both our scientific knowledge and the application of scientific principles in the common affairs of life have reached a stage far in advance of any previous age. The claim is, no doubt, well founded. But even in these days, there is a great deal of science that is falsely so-called.

Every age has its pretenders and charlatans, or "cranks," men who run with the multitude and captivate the popular ear by their tricks and arts, until they are able to lead a certain portion of the public in their toils, and stand forth, in their estimation, as the exponents of progress. It is not surprising, therefore, that, in these days, the scientific crank should be abroad, hunting in the lion's skin, like a certain animal in one of Æsop's fables. Generally, too, he owns a printing-press, and publishes a scientific journal, in which he discusses the ignorance and short-comings of scientific men, and blazons forth his own wonderful discoveries. For the most part, he has some favorite theory by which he accounts for supposed difficulties, or solves problems, which are confessedly intricate, by a mere stroke of the pen. Perhaps he has discovered that Newton's *Principia* and Laplace's *Mecanique Celeste* are only a waste of breath, and a weariness to the mind, because electricity is the hidden bond of the universe, and the motive power by which the worlds are governed. He escapes the necessity of accounting for and explaining the operation of gravitation, because he says there is no such thing as gravitation; and it never occurs to him that it is just as difficult to account for and explain the operation of electricity, when substituted for gravitation. Or, looking in a different direction, he has read the inmost recesses of nature's mysterious operations like an open book. He knows all about the origin of life, the beginning and growth of organisms, the occult physiological processes by which, out of a homogeneous substance, the most varied organs are differentiated. He gravely tells you how ignorant of all these things scientific men are; but he has the key that unlocks the iron door, and lets you into the secret by giving you the simple explanation that it is all electricity, the direct relation of the negative and the positive. If it occurs to you to ask how, he proceeds to give you an answer by setting up page upon page of the most unmitigated stuff that has ever escaped the eagle-eye of censorship—studiously obscure, because it is intended to appear profound. Or, again, professing a religious interest,

he claims to have discovered that all the leaders of scientific thought are held captive by the erroneous scientific theories which they teach, and that the gospel of a new philosophy and a new science, which he is promulgating, is to confound these mighty men and vanquish the hosts of infidelity and atheism. He "demolishes" Tyndal and Helmholtz by overthrowing the wave-theory of sound, although he does not appear to know the difference between longitudinal and transverse vibrations, or understand how to compute the relative intensity of a sound at different points, by comparing the squares of their distance from the point of origin. He "confounds" Haeckel by suggesting that what the latter took to be the marks of gill-arches on the necks of embryonic fishes, are only *creases* in the flesh, formed by the pressing of the head forward upon the breast in the embryo, although he does not pretend ever to have observed the embryonic development of any animal, or to have examined its anatomical structure.

In all these cases there is an implied compliment to science, because such performances presume upon a public interest in science. It is humiliating, however, to reflect how easily duped the public must be; for such work could not continue long unless there were "money in it." Thinking people, of course, are not deceived. It does not require much acumen to see the protruding ears and recognize the familiar bray of the would-be lion; and it is easily seen that there is no science in all this array of high-sounding phrases. There is not a single new principle or a safe and legitimate conclusion that can be added to the store of human knowledge, or used as a stepping-stone to further investigation. Either misapprehension or perversion is at the bottom of this kind of scientific discussion. Perhaps facts are misapprehended, or accepted scientific principles misunderstood. The sciolist then proceeds, by imperfect generalization and false induction, to derive his conclusions and establish his system, which betrays ignorance like the darkness of Egypt—so dense that it can be felt. Or, perhaps, he is destructive rather than constructive, and he undertakes to refute the ac-



cepted teachings of science. In this case he succeeds best by substituting words for thoughts, taking sentences or statements out of their connection, and thus perverting the meaning of his opponent. He literally follows the advice of Mephistopheles to the student, "to stick to words : "

\* \* \* \* \*

"Denn eben wo Begriffe fehlen,  
Da stellt ein Wort zu rechter Zeit sich ein.  
Mit Worten lässt sich trefflich streiten,  
Mit Worten ein System bereiten,  
An Worte lässt sich trefflich glauben,  
Von einem Wort lässt sich kein Jota rauben."

There is, however, another species of science, falsely so-called, which, although more respectable as to its paternity, from the scientific standpoint, is equally vicious in its method, and mischievous in its tendency. It is that which goes upon the assumption that all objects of thought must be of the same order, that the data of science must all be obtained the same way, and that the results of investigation and induction in the sphere of nature must include the sum of all knowable things. Proceeding upon this assumption, the investigator goes to work armed with the scalpel, the microscope, the crucible and the balances to unravel the mysteries of the universe. He finds that living matter does not differ in weight and chemical constitution from dead matter; he can discover no substance or agent in the one that is not present in the other; he sees only different properties, of the same kind of substance, and these properties, he says, are produced by the particular conditions to which the substance is subjected. He concludes, therefore, that what we call life is only the result of chemical action, a property of matter; and protoplasm is only a molecular machine. Again, seeing that, in the growth of living beings, the homogeneous protoplasm is differentiated into the various tissues, one of which, nervous tissue, is sensitive to impressions made upon it by foreign bodies, he proceeds to investigate this phenomenon. He can find no new agent; he sees only a chemical change in

the structure of the nervous matter, and finds that this is accompanied by a peculiar experience on the part of the living being, which we call feeling or consciousness. He infers, accordingly, that consciousness is a property of living matter in certain conditions. In the same way he resolves thought into the decomposition of brain substance, and will into reflex action of the nervous system. Thus he constructs a chain, the links of which are matter, life, consciousness, thought and will; and when he is done, he tells you that he sees in matter "the promise and potency" of all the manifestations of the universe. I have said that this kind of science is more respectable, as to its paternity, than the other, and so it is, for many of those who are responsible for such a conclusion in the name of science have done excellent work in their respective fields of labor, and have made for themselves a brilliant reputation. But it appears to us to be equally unscientific. There is no attempt to prove that dead matter has ever, under any combination of circumstances or conditions, been known to manifest spontaneously the properties of living matter. And yet, while this is admitted, we are simply told that at some time "it must have done so." So far as changes in nervous tissue are concerned, it is admitted that every physical cause has its physical effect quantitatively equivalent, so that the state which we call consciousness is over and above the physical effect, and yet no attempt is made to explain what it is that is conscious or how this peculiar effect should follow. All along this chain, therefore, not a single transition from one link to another is explained, nor is there any demonstration of their identity attempted. A certain relation or dependence only is established, the rest is all assumption or assertion. As a hypothesis or speculation it might go for what it is worth, making full room for investigation and discovery, were it not for the mischievous assumption which is made to crown it all. This assumption is that anything that cannot be discovered by scientific investigation or the existence of which cannot be demonstrated by the ordinary processes of reasoning, either has no objective existence or, at least, its ex-

istence cannot be known, and so far forth it does not concern man at all. In such science there is no room for God or spirit, and the sunlight of the heavenly world is forever shut out from the heart and consciousness of man. It is not surprising, therefore, to hear Tyndal confess that it is not when he feels strongest and his mind is clearest, but in the moments when he is weakest, that such a scheme of the world commends itself to him. He means to say, no doubt, that there are times of spiritual exaltation when he seems to see another world, and voices from it float in upon his soul; when the overshadowing influence of a Higher Power comes down upon him like the dew of the morning, and his soul drinks in a sense of spiritual realities, as the mariner upon the ocean at night inhales the spicy breezes wafted from the fertile island which his eyes fail to discern. Men of genius, like the late Professor Clifford, in pinning their faith to such a narrow conception of the world, it seems to us, behave like the man who is color-blind, and cannot tell red from green. Seeing no difference, he insists there is none, and for him red and green do not exist as separate colors. Naturalists tell us that unused organs grow weaker and finally lose their function. It would, perhaps, be uncourteous to say that such men have no spiritual sense, and are, in this respect, like the eyeless fish found in subterranean streams. No doubt all men have a spiritual sense. But in such men it is unused. They are conversant only with nature, and use only those faculties which are exercised in their scientific investigations. Accordingly, their spiritual sense becomes blunted, and they cannot hear the voices from a higher realm, or hear them only in moments of spiritual exaltation, when the din of the world is hushed in their ears. But when they deny the existence of the spiritual world on so-called scientific grounds, they put themselves in an attitude which is certainly unscientific.

The truth is, the scope of science is limited, and there are things the perception of which is not within the grasp of science. There are truths which cannot be discovered by a process of induction. There are axioms and fundamental princi-

ples which the reason at once accepts as true, and uses as premises from which to derive certain conclusions. There are immediate facts of consciousness which need no other authentication than their presence on the tablet of the mind. Indeed, the very process of investigation for the acquisition of knowledge begins in the recognition of these truths, and without them science is impossible. But over and above these things there are facts and data which, in the nature of the case, the inductions of science cannot reach. They come, if they come at all, from beyond man, from beyond the natural world, and, entering the sphere of consciousness, they are accepted by faith as their own sufficient authentication. But, accepted in this way, and entering into real relation with the facts of experience, they may become the data of scientific knowledge.

Among these things we may name the nature of the Deity. We do not mean the existence of God, for that, we think, is an immediate fact of consciousness which is present with all men. Nor do we mean His attributes, such as goodness, righteousness and holiness; for these, too, are manifest in His works, and authenticated to the conscience of men. "Because that which is known of God is manifest in them (the heathen); for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they (the heathen) are without excuse." Rom. i: 19-20. In corroboration of this statement of the Scriptures we need but refer to Plato's noble conception of the Deity, and to Mr. Matthew Arnold's "a something not ourselves, which makes for righteousness." But, as over against these conceptions, we mean the personal character of God as to its essence, which is love, a character realized in the world and among men as a factor of human history. This, while it answers to the original fact of consciousness, and satisfies man's deepest longings, is known not as the result of scientific research, as an inference from nature, or as an intuitive idea; it comes only as the contents of a revelation from a higher sphere which is ap-

prehended by faith. Then only, when it enters into concrete relation with human development, does it become a matter of history and an object of scientific investigation.

Again, the idea of creation or the beginning of things lies beyond the ken of scientific apprehension. Science is competent to take things as they are in objective nature, and by observation and inquiry learn their properties and determine their relations. It can do more. Knowing the changes to which they are subject and the forces which produce these changes, it can, on the basis of marks or impressions which indicate former conditions, unravel their history, and, perhaps, trace them backward from stage to stage, and, in living things, from generation to generation. Here, for instance, is the towering form of a majestic oak. For centuries it has stood on the mountain side like a sentinel of the woods watching through summer's suns and winter's snows the growth and death of hundreds of its fellows. The student of nature, by examining the structure of its trunk, can tell precisely how often it dropped its leaves and renewed them again, where branches grew which were afterwards obliterated in the outer growth of the trunk, where injuries were received which were afterward covered with new wood, and such other facts of its life which are all faithfully recorded. He can tell, too, that it grew from an acorn which was the fruit of a similar tree, and thus trace its history backward to preceding generations. But when, in thought, he reaches the first oak, he must stop, and the case is not changed if he supposes the oak to have been derived from some other form of a tree. He will come to a point where he must stop. So also in the history of the earth as a whole. It is possible to trace it through stages and processes by which it gradually assumed its present form. In its bosom it bears the record of its history. But what lies back of this record and of the history to which it is the key? The beginning is not recorded, and, in the nature of the case, it cannot be. The mind is shut up to one of two conclusions. Either the earth, or the system of which it is a part, always was, or else it, the earth or the system, must have

had a beginning. The impossibility of conceiving of an eternal series of fortuitous changes through which the earth could pass so as to realize the present order of the world, may dispose the mind to assume a beginning as the only rational conclusion, but science cannot know such a beginning, or determine the nature of it. The knowledge comes by revelation and is received by faith. "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God, so that the things which are seen were not made of things which do appear." Hebrews xi: 3. No matter, therefore, how much man may learn of the stages through which the earth has passed, the length of time involved in these processes of change, or the relation and derivation of the different orders of existence upon the earth, the idea of creation cannot be set aside by any theory of evolution or development. The beginning of existence is one thing, and a series of changes by which a given stage of existence is reached, is a very different thing. It is important, therefore, that creation and development be not confounded.

In the same way, we think, the origin of consciousness, of will and of the idea of right or moral obligation, cannot be determined by scientific investigation. It has become the fashion of late to account for these factors of human existence by resolving them into cosmic dust, as it were, and then deriving them, in their finished form, by a process of gradual differentiation or organic development. For instance, Professor Michael Foster says: "The doctrine of evolution compels us to admit that consciousness must be potentially present in the simple protoplasm of the amœba, and must be similarly present in all the tissues of the highly-developed animal, instead of being confined to some limited portion of the nervous system. . . . And, as far as we can see, there are no just reasons why the differentiation which sets apart the nervous tissue from other parts of the body should not obtain in the nervous tissue itself and the obscure rudiments of consciousness present in all nervous material become by differentiation developed, in some particular kinds of nervous substance, into consciousness more

strictly so called." Even if this statement were accepted in its wholeness, it would not explain the origin of consciousness, unless we should make consciousness a mere property of matter, of which there is not a particle of evidence. Accordingly, Professor McKendrick says: "No one now doubts that consciousness has an anatomical substratum, but the great problem of the relation between the two is as far from solution as in the days when little or nothing was known of the physiology of the nervous system."

The will has been resolved by some into reflex action of the nerve centres. It can be readily shown that such a theory is not in accordance with the most common facts of our daily life. But in addition to this, such a conception of will is in direct conflict with the testimony of our own consciousness. Dr. W. B. Carpenter maintains "that we have exactly the same evidence of the existence of this *self-determining power within ourselves*, that we have of the existence of *a material world outside ourselves*," and in either case, "the common-sense decision of mankind in regard to these facts of consciousness is practically worth more than all the arguments of all the logicians who have discussed our basis of belief in them." If this be so, it is evident that man is not an automaton, but an agent who feels that he has control over his actions, and is responsible for them. But what is the ground of such responsibility? Here we are confronted with the idea of right and of duty or moral obligation. Mr. Herbert Spencer takes great pains to show that this idea is gradually developed in the evolution of man, and tries to prove that the selfish principle, tempered by a wider range of knowledge, passes over into care for the race and thus gradually becomes altruism. The idea of right, then, is based on concern for the common good; that is right which ministers to the welfare of the race. We believe that, properly understood, the converse of the last proposition is true: That which is right, ministers to the welfare of the race; but in the form in which altruistic philosophers put it, it is false, and contrary to the moral consciousness of man. "*Fiat justitia ruat cælum*" em-

bodies a sounder philosophy, and accords more fully with the history of mankind in all stages of development than the idea of a coarse or refined eudæmonism. Of course we do not mean to say that men's judgment of what is right is always reliable. We mean, simply, that the moral idea is primary and fundamental; that men make a distinction between what is right and what is wrong on the basis of right and wrong alone, while their moral judgment needs to be enlightened, and they only gradually come to a clear apprehension of what is right. There is an important truth here in the theory of evolution or gradual derivation of the essential attributes of man, both in the history of the race and the development of the individual. But our point is that in all the cases to which we have referred, we are confronted with something that authenticates itself to the human consciousness as coming from a higher source than mere nature, and possessing a character that cannot be fathomed by scientific research.

And finally we may include in this category the ultimate destiny of man, or the idea of immortality. It is true, the longing after immortality, which is a part of man's very being, is an argument in favor of continued existence. The process of our earthly life, the gradual ripening of our powers, the formation of character and the perfection of our moral nature by salutary discipline, add force to the presumption previously raised so as to make a future life almost, if not quite, a certainty. But there is, we think, no scientific demonstration of man's immortality. The full certainty and nature of it are revealed from a higher sphere, and exemplified in the history of our Elder Brother.

We have dwelt on these limitations of science at some length, both for the sake of science itself and for the sake of other interests. Science ought not to be expected to render a service which is not in its province, for such an expectation imposes an unnecessary burden on science, and deprives other interests of their legitimate work and functions. It is often said, with reference to one or the other of the points to which we



have referred: If it were only possible to afford scientific proof of the fact, so as to satisfy the honest skeptic and silence the caviler. Any such proof, in the nature of the case, would partake of the character of a miracle, and while it might silence the caviler, it would not convince him. If such a fact cannot lay hold of the deeper part of man's nature, and authenticate itself there, it would scarcely find lodgment in the mind through any other channel. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

Having given the characteristics and limited the scope of science, we proceed to inquire what benefits science bestows in its appropriate field. In these days it is scarcely necessary to call attention to the material advantages which result from the prosecution of scientific research in the way of invention and discovery. The material prosperity of our age and the high degree of comfort which men generally enjoy are directly traceable to this source. But this fact is so generally recognized that we may be spared the effort to enumerate benefits of this kind. To quote words which we have used in a different connection: "At the present day no one at all conversant with the course of events will deny that the progress of scientific discovery and the application of scientific principles in the arts, have done and are doing more to advance the material comfort and prosperity of mankind than any other human agency to which we can point. The difference between the slow and cumbersome methods of our forefathers and the enterprise, activity and celerity of our day, between the scanty subsistence which they obtained with limited means from chary and reluctant mother nature and the abundance and variety which she generously pours into our laps, is but a difference in scientific attainment. The contrast between their hemmed in and contracted existence, the bonds of superstition and the slavery of ignorance and oppression to which they were subject, and the free and enlarged life which we enjoy, only marks a difference of scientific culture. Surely, science

is a beneficent genius, inspiring and working continuously those things which promote the welfare and happiness of man."

Science, however, confers a greater boon than physical comfort and material prosperity. Knowledge in general is elevating and ennobling, and to this the knowledge of nature, or scientific knowledge in the wider sense, is no exception. Accordingly, we hold that scientific culture is a greater blessing than the comfort and prosperity which result from the application of scientific knowledge to the amelioration of man's condition. It may be objected to this, that scientific culture is of a low type, and that in the field of culture, science yields less satisfactory results than other methods of discipline, so that, after all, its greatest advantage lies on the practical side. We are not willing to grant that this objection is valid. Its apparent force lies in the fact that there is a wide difference between what we may call the naïve contemplation of things and the way in which science regards them. Here is a beautiful flower, for instance. The ordinary observer looks at it, perhaps examines it closely, and notices its beautiful form, delicate structure, charming color and delicious fragrance. He receives an impression of the flower as a whole; to him it is an object of beauty. The botanist, on the other hand, examines the structure of the parts in their relation to each other, and his idea of the flower is very different from that of the observer just described. To him it is an object of scientific interest. Now it is said that the scientific interest interferes with or destroys the æsthetic interest, and that for this reason the scientific observer stands on a lower plane. This reasoning involves two fallacies. The first is that while it is true that the scientific interest, when it prevails, drives out the æsthetic interest, it does not follow that the botanist can have only a scientific interest in the flower. He is man as well as botanist; he has a phantasy as well as perceptive powers; and he may exercise the former and enjoy the beauty of his flower as much as his more ignorant brother. The second fallacy is that the scientific observer, as such, is said to stand on a lower plane. If this means a lower plane of culture,

we demur. Either plane affords an imperfect view. Which is the higher depends upon the stand-point of the critic. The highest type of culture is that which affects the whole man and enables him, in full sympathy with the age in which he lives, and aglow with the noblest aspirations of mankind, to receive from the stream of human development the best it can give, and to contribute, in turn, that which will minister to the true dignity of man and the glory of God. Now if it be said that the highest type of culture does not necessarily involve a knowledge of the external world, it is a sufficient answer to say that although there was a time when the statement was true, that time has long since passed by. In the culture of classical antiquity, than which there has been none higher, what we have called the naïve contemplation of the world prevailed. It is the stream of life gushing fresh from the fountain, rich because of its own glorious contents. Development is from within; there is a peculiar flavor in every human interest which makes the age unique—a something as distinctive and peculiar in thought, feeling and expression as is the famous repose of classic art. But all this is characteristic of the youth of the world, the spring-time of humanity. When, now, this period was past, it was, in the nature of the case, past never to return. So in the history of the German nation. It, too, had its youth, its spring-time of buoyant hope and vigorous, gushing life. Accordingly, we find the manifestation of this naïve spirit in the literature of the nation about the time of the Hohenstaufens. But later this naïve spirit is lost and the Germans become cosmopolitan, alert, critical, the very leaders of the intellectual commerce of the world. To see the difference, it is only necessary to place side by side the *Nibelungen Lied* and Schiller's *Wallenstein*, *Wolfram von Eschenbach* or *Walther von der Vogelweide* and Goethe. The contrast is most striking, and it sets in a clear light the distinction which we have been trying to enforce. We repeat, therefore, that the highest type of culture must be in sympathy with the age to which it belongs. If this is true, it follows, we think, that the prosecu-

tion of scientific study is not a mere "bread and butter" affair. It is, rather, an essential element of true culture, without which any scheme of discipline or education would fail to meet the requirements of the age. God forbid that we should undervalue other means of culture, the classic languages or the "humanities," mathematics and philosophy. Each and all of these, properly co-ordinated, dominated by devout faith and thoroughly permeated by the spirit of Christianity, are necessary factors of sound education.

By thus limiting the scope of science on the one hand, and yet making it an essential element of culture on the other, we give it a position which is advantageous to science itself, and, at the same time, favorable to the realization of the highest type of manhood. For, after all, science is not the chief good for man; there are higher interests to be conserved, and in order to these, science is not the only or even the chief means. In an address before the biological section of the British Association, at Southport, England, Professor E. Ray Lankester used the following language: "This, then, is the faith which has taken shape in proportion as the innate desire of man for more knowledge has asserted itself—namely, that there is no greater good than the increase of science; that through it all other good will follow. Good as science is in itself, the desire and search for it is even better, raising men above vile things and worthless competition to a fuller life and keener enjoyments. Through it we believe that man will be saved from misery and degradation, not merely acquiring new material powers, but learning to use and to guide his life with understanding. Through science he will be freed from the fetters of superstition; through faith in science he will acquire a new and enduring delight in the exercise of his capacities; he will gain a zest and interest in life such as the present phase of culture fails to supply." There is much force in this statement of the case for science, but it claims too much. It makes the amelioration of man's condition of greater importance than it really is, and attributes to the search for knowledge an influence which it

alone does not possess. The inner, spiritual man is of more account than external conditions and relations, and the mere knowledge of the latter, therefore, cannot be the highest good for the former. Character is more important than knowledge; the will is higher than the intellect. It follows, therefore, that there is a greater good for man than science or the prosecution of scientific work for the increase of science, a greater good than is found in any single discipline or means of culture. Such good must address itself to the will rather than the reason, challenging all the powers of man, fostering their growth and directing their energy, so that, working in perfect harmony, they become the instruments of the will working according to the divine law of love. In the realization of such character culture reaches its highest type, and the broader such culture the better, including art and science and every other human interest—"all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

## V.

### LIMIT OF PROBATION.\*

BY REV. W. RUPP, D.D.

The conception of individual human life in this world as a process of probation for a future life is inconsistent with the leading idea of Augustinian and Calvinistic theology. According to the teaching of this theology, mankind had its probation in Adam, and failed, and that failure now involves the whole race, not only in the misery of total depravity, but also in the guilt which makes every one liable to the punishment of eternal damnation. The individual has lost all moral freedom, and all ability for good. In such circumstances there can now be no more probation, as moral trial, in any real sense. The race has become a mass of perdition, out of which sovereign grace, by an exercise of irresistible power, saves some individuals, and leaves others to perish. Salvation is purely a divine work. Those who are saved stand merely in a passive relation to the saving grace, and can exercise no real influence over the result. And those who are not saved stand in a like passive relation to the sovereign will which determines their fate.

The idea of probation, on the contrary, implies that the issue of life, whether it be salvation or perdition, depends not merely upon the will of God, or upon any external force or circumstances, but upon personal decision and conduct. The question

\* Although there is a standing statement in the *Prospectus* of this Review that the individual writers alone are responsible for the views presented in their articles, yet, inasmuch as this article discusses a subject in Eschatology in reference to which special concern is entertained among the churches at the present time, we deem it proper to call special attention to this statement.—*Eds. Ref. Quart. Rev.*

of salvation or damnation is one that every individual must decide for itself. This implies that there is still a certain degree of moral freedom remaining in the sinner. The sinner has not become a block or a stone. Though he could not throw off the dominion of sin and save himself merely by the exertion of his own power, he is able, of his own motion, to accept the proffered grace or to reject it, and one or the other he must do. With reference to this he is on trial. The trial is involved in the offer of saving grace to a person which, though sinful, still possesses the power of self-determination and choice. This gives to human life a distinctively ethical import and meaning. Men are not like puppets in a mock drama, whose motions are determined by the connecting wires, but they are self-acting agents. They are not merely, in a passive, mechanical way, acting a part and fulfilling a destiny assigned to them by their Maker, but they are, by their own free activity, in reciprocal relation with their natural and spiritual environment, forming a moral character that will determine their everlasting weal or woe.\*

As against the old theology, this view is doubtless correct. It is sustained by the testimony of human conscience and by the teaching of Scripture. Men feel that they are free, moral agents, who are responsible for their conduct and shaping their destiny by their own acts. This truth is indelibly written on the heart, and can never be wholly effaced. Men may, on deterministic principles, build systems of philosophy and theology that leave no room for human freedom or for personal responsibility; but to such systems the heart and conscience can never long continue to yield their assent. The enlightened conscience

\* It may be said, indeed, that according to Augustinian theology the eternal condition of men is related likewise to their own character and conduct. Men are not saved irrespective of their character and works. God will be careful to bestow the grace of faith upon those whom He is going to save, and to work in them repentance and sanctification. But character thus formed is not the result of an ethical process, involving probation, but merely of a divine operation.

bears testimony to the freedom of personality, both in relation to the power of sin in human nature and in relation to the requirements of the divine law and the offers of divine grace. Hence, though fallen, man, in his present period of development, feels that his ultimate destiny is not yet decided, and that the decision of it will depend upon his own determination and conduct.

It is hardly necessary to say that the teaching of the Bible is in harmony with this view. Cain, though a sinner, is nevertheless addressed as one still having power to do well, and to rule over the sin that couches at his door; and he is told that his acceptance with the Lord, or his rejection, will depend upon his own behavior. The Israelites have set before them life and death, the blessing and the curse, in the institutions of the law, and they are reminded that their future happiness or misery will depend upon their own *choice* (Deut. 30: 19). The exhortation to choose life, if it be seriously meant, implies the power of an alternative determination in reference to the divine law, and also the fact that one's future welfare depends upon such determination. In the New Testament the blessings of salvation are everywhere represented as depending upon the same condition of voluntary acceptance and appropriation. The offer of salvation is freely made in Christ; but men are not saved without a positive act of faith, whereby they accept Christ and surrender themselves to Him in free and loving obedience. That the process of salvation is not compulsory, but free, is plain from the fact that men are everywhere *exhorted* to believe the Gospel, to repent and to follow Christ, which implies the power of acting in opposite ways. And in respect to the exercise of this power relatively to the offer of salvation in Christ, men are now on probation or trial, the issue depending on their own behavior.

But while the conception of probation is legitimate and true, as far as it goes, it is nevertheless not an adequate conception of the meaning of human life in the period of its development. Man is here, not merely in a state of probation, but in a process



of divine culture or training. God in Christ is the trainer.\* God is related to man, during the period of his pupilage, not merely as a passive spectator of his trials, his struggles and his achievements, but as a sympathetic, ever-active instructor or teacher. He is not merely amusing Himself by looking on and beholding what man, in the exercise of his will, or under the influence simply of his environment, is going to make of himself; but He is engaged in educating and training him for his destiny, in directing the process of his development, in arranging circumstances and applying means adapted to the purpose of leading him to realize the proper idea of his existence, without, however, interfering with his self-determination or doing injury to his freedom. This divine process of training, as it has to do with a free, personal spirit, whose voluntary activity it does not suspend, but rather solicit, is indeed an ethical process, and therefore involves probation. The probation, however, is not the essence of the process, nor is it the main object of the process. A pupil at school is under probation. He may use for his benefit or abuse, to his irreparable loss, the advantages of the school. He may suffer the educational forces to produce their proper effect upon his mind, or he may resist them and lose forever their beneficent influence. It is this possibility that make a boy's school-life a period of probation for his after-life, and therefore, also, a period of peril. But the probation is, after all, not the main design or intent of the school. While it is inevitable, it is nevertheless something merely subordinate and incidental. The real intention or design of the school is not to serve as a means of probation, but of culture. All the arrangements of the school and all the efforts of teachers are directed to this end. And so the divine object or purpose of the school of human life, though it necessarily involves probation, or trial, is not probation, but the perfect development of spiritual life and the formation of perfect moral character. And to the accomplishment of this object is directed the whole energy of God in the order of nature and in the order of grace.

\* It is this view of God's relation to man that underlies the treatise on *The Instructor*, by Clement, of Alexandria.

Some suppose that the realization of this divine purpose can be liable to no possible failure. They hold that sooner or later the divine work of education or salvation must be successfully accomplished in the case of every human being. According to this view, there is no limit to probation short of the successful accomplishment of the moral process (the salvation of the individual), however far that may need to be prolonged. This is the doctrine of universal salvation, which, though by many Christian people regarded with horror, as a mere product of unbelief or profanity, has nevertheless been held by great and good men, from Origen and Gregory of Nyssa down to Bengel and Schleiermacher. It is generally based on the Christian conception of the nature and character of God. God, as revealed in Christ, is love. Love is the primary quality of His being, determining all His attributes and ruling in all His actions. But of such a God it is impossible to think otherwise than as desiring the salvation of all moral beings; and this desire is distinctly affirmed of Him in Scripture (1 Tim. 2: 4; 2 Pet. 3: 9). God has not created and ordained any one to perdition, but has appointed all unto salvation, though it may be in different degrees and forms of glory. And he is now constantly exerting Himself in order to make the salvation of each one a reality. This is the chief end of the divine direction and government of the world. But to suppose a possibility of failure here, it is said, would be to suppose some imperfection or impotence in God. A being of infinite knowledge and infinite power must be competent to bring about the salvation of all men, however perverse they may be, and however stubborn their resistance. It may, indeed, require æons of discipline, and æons of æons of penal suffering to accomplish the task, but at last it will be accomplished, and all will be saved. The saving and probationary discipline will not cease until this point has been reached.

It is commonly acknowledged that it is difficult, if not impossible, to refute this view by simple reference to texts of Scripture. The passages which are usually quoted in opposition to it, like Matt. 25: 46, Mark 3: 29 and 9: 47, and Rev. 14: 11,

are not decisive, and may be explained in a manner consistent with the idea of universal salvation. The fact that eternal or *aionian* punishment is spoken of as the doom of the wicked in the day of judgment, it might be maintained, does not prove that punishment will be *endless*, but only that it will continue through one or more of the *æons*\* or ages, which compose endless duration. If the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be *forgiven* in this or any future *æon*, that, it might be said, does not preclude the hope that in some future *æon* the penalty may be fully exhausted and the last farthing paid (Matt. 5: 26). It is said, in the book of Revelation, that if any worship the beast and receive his mark, they will be tormented with fire and brimstone, and the smoke of their torment will go up into ages of ages; but this proposition, it might be explained, while it does not affirm an absolutely endless duration of torment, is, besides, merely conditional, and there is no proof that the condition will ever become a reality.

But while the opinion of unlimited probation and of universal restitution might be supported by an exclusive consideration of the nature and character of God, and while single passages of Scripture might be so interpreted as to favor it, we believe that it encounters insuperable difficulties in the facts of human nature, and further that the general tenor of the teaching of the Bible is against it. The quality of freedom, or the power of conscious self-determination is a constituent element of human personality. And it is the possession of this power that makes man a moral being, separating him from every lower form of existence, and giving him an infinite dignity and value in the sight of God. But the possession of this power involves the possibility that

\* The Biblical term *αἰών*, Heb. *olām*, signifies neither endless duration nor eternity in the strict sense, but a period, or cycle of time, determined by some particular phase of the world's development. The institutions of the Old Testament are often said to be *l'olām*, *aionian*. The Passover, for instance, is to be an *aionian ordinance*, νόμιμον αἰώνιον, according to LXX (Ex. 12: 14, 17). That eternal life is endless is to be inferred, not merely from the designation *aionian*, but from the fact that it is life in communion with God.

man may act either in harmony with the law of his being, which is the expression in his own constitution of the divine will concerning him, or in opposition thereto. And on his voluntary action with reference to the divine will or law will depend his own happiness or misery. With the free self-determination of the will in reference to good and evil, God cannot interfere, without impairing the integrity of human personality; nor can He arbitrarily suspend the consequences of moral action, so as, for example, by a mere act of omnipotence, to connect happiness with a person whose will is evil. Here there is a limit to God's saving energy. He cannot save those who are unwilling to repent and to be saved. Salvation is not a natural, but an ethical good, that can only be wrought out in and through the human will itself. This is forgotten by the advocates of universal salvation. God's love, indeed, is universal, and embraces all men, and He sincerely desires the salvation of all. God, moreover, is infinite in knowledge and power. But He has Himself set limits to the exercise of His knowledge and power by calling into existence a world of free, personal beings. And these limits He cannot now break down without doing violence to His very love itself. Love, in the ethical sense, is only possible between personal beings, who are able freely to reciprocate it. God could not love mere *things*; and if He were to invade the freedom of the will, even for the purpose of salvation, He would reduce man, to the extent of such invasion, to the capacity of a *thing* which He could no longer really love. Salvation, then, depends not merely upon the purpose and love of God, but also upon the determination and conduct of man, who, in the freedom of his will, possesses power even to frustrate the divine purpose of salvation.

But it may be said that this is, after all, only establishing the abstract possibility of a failure of salvation, and not proving that this possibility will ever be realized. It is plain that God cannot save men in opposition to their will. But have we reason to suppose that in any single case such opposition will always continue to exist? If moral freedom is an essential quality of the human will, must we not then suppose that it

will always endure? But if the freedom of the will can never perish, even in a state of sin indefinitely long continued, then what is there to hinder a person at any time in the progress of the ages from repenting and being saved? Have we, then, reason to suppose that the freedom of the will, in the form of capacity for alternative choice, will always endure? In answer to this question we may appeal, first, to the known facts of human nature. We know that even in this life character tends to become fixed. The exercise of the will through any series of volitions tends to produce a moral habit; and the habit again exercises an important influence over subsequent volitions. In proportion as the habit grows, the limits of choice become contracted, and the person comes to act more and more from an inward necessity or unconscious spontaneity. In the case of normal development, the formal freedom, or power of choice, with which the moral process begins, is transformed into real or completed freedom, which is one with necessity and excludes the possibility of sin. Such is the freedom of God and of the holy angels. In the case of abnormal or sinful development the acts of the person come to be controlled more and more by the unconscious force exercised by the evil character or habit, the real power of self-determination having perished, and the empty form only remaining. This state of moral necessity is perhaps never fully realized in the present life. The saint may never here become so far advanced in holiness that he can no longer sin; nor may the sinner proceed so far in his sinful development as to lose all power of self-determination, and to become wholly fixed in evil. There may always remain at least a minimum of evil in the one and of good in the other; and we may, therefore, never be able to say of any particular person that his character has become unalterably fixed. But the law is clearly discernible according to which character always *tends* to become fixed. And there is no reason to suppose that this law will ever cease to operate. But if it does not, then every soul will at last reach a stage of moral development in which there will be no more possibility of change, but in which the character or moral habit

will have become fixed forever. Then there will be no more possibility of salvation for the sinner, not because God could no longer forgive, but because man can no longer repent and accept forgiveness.

In support of this view, we may appeal also to the teaching of Scripture. The Bible speaks of a hardening of the heart, which makes men deaf to the words of Christ, blind to the offers of divine grace and insusceptible to the influence of the Holy Spirit. Such hardening must not be regarded as the effect of an immediate divine operation in the soul. It can only be the consequence of personal conduct, the spiritual organism growing to the manner in which it is constantly exercised, in the same way that the physical organism becomes at last set or used to a prolonged series even of unnatural acts. If such hardening is nevertheless at times ascribed to a divine operation or agency, nothing more can be supposed to be meant than that God has implanted in the moral constitution of the soul, and there maintains the laws according to which the moral process goes forward, and, in case of perverse action on the part of the Ego, leads to obduracy. Again, the Apostle John speaks of a sin which is unto death, and concerning which prayer would be no longer of any avail (1 John 5: 16); and as if to guard against the idea of supposing this sin to consist in any one isolated act of transgression, he adds immediately the statement that "all unrighteousness is sin," thus intimating that the mortal sin, whatever may be its form, is only the cumulative effect of a course of unrighteous conduct. And, finally, Christ speaks of one sin, namely, blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, which, whoever commits, has never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin (*ἐννοήσας ἔστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος*, according to the true reading in Mark 3: 29); and this could hardly mean anything else than having become eternally fixed in sin, after having persistently rejected Christ, the manifestation of the highest good, and wilfully resisted the illuminating influence of the Holy Spirit. And the Bible also informs us of at least one historical personage in whom this possibility of utter and final perdi-

tion seems to have been realized, namely, Judas Iscariot, the traitor, concerning whom Christ declares, and the declaration is recorded by two of the Evangelists, that "it were good for that man if he had never been born." The fixedness of an irrevocable doom of woe could be expressed in no stronger language. We are told afterwards that he repented himself and brought back the money for which he had sold his Lord; but his repentance was only the despairing sorrow of the world, which worketh death (2 Cor. 7: 10); and so it is added that "he went away and hanged himself." The great dramatist, Shakespeare, knew well how to represent the hopeless despair of a hardened sinner. We have an example of such despair in the character of Richard III., who, in his last moments, when the accusations of all the souls that he has murdered are sounding in his ears, and his conscience, with a thousand tongues, proclaims his guilt, after vainly struggling against the sense of condemnation which forces the cold drops from his trembling flesh, at last exclaims: "I shall despair," and in that despair dies on the morrow, shouting, "My kingdom for a horse!" And we have another such example in the character of Lady Macbeth, who, in her troubled sleep, when she dreams of her deep and damning guilt, and madly wrings her blood-stained hands that can never be cleansed, gives no sign of repentance or sorrow, but at last ends her wild raving with the hopeless cry, "What's done cannot be undone."

There is then a limit to the time of probation and to the possibility of salvation; and that limit is not any particular hour arbitrarily determined by providence, but the moment when character becomes fixed, and the freedom of choice is sublated by the force of habit growing out of the moral conduct. But in order to answer the question when this moment may be supposed to have arrived, it will be necessary to consider what are the conditions of complete moral development in the case of man, or what are the objects which condition the moral process, and in their relation to the human spirit become to it a source of probation. If the human Ego were shut up within itself; if



it stood in no relation to anything and had no knowledge of anything outside of itself, there could be for it no probation and no moral development. The good which it is to choose, and in regard to the choice of which it is on trial, must be presented to it in an objective order of existence; and this order of existence must correspond to its nature and capacities. Such an order of existence is the natural and spiritual universe, through which the being of God, as well as His character and will, are revealed to the human soul as the good which it is required to choose, and by means of which, as embracing all the requisite incentives and motives, God proposes to educate the soul and move it to the realization of its proper destiny. The lowest form of this revelation of the good, or of God, is that which takes place in the order of the natural world, and in relation to this, therefore, man receives his first trial. This revelation and this trial are represented by the symbol of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil in Paradise. But the natural world is not the only medium of divine revelation; and, therefore, the probation which arises out of man's relation to this, however it may turn out, is not the only form of probation through which man is called to pass. There is a revelation also in the process of human history, in the development of the family and of the nation, together with the various relations and interests which this development involves, such as labor, trade, government, education, art and religion; and this also involves probation for individual men, for God is truly in this process, manifesting His gracious and holy will and using the historical forces as means of training and discipline for the human soul. But there is still a higher and more glorious revelation of God: it is the revelation of God in Christ and in Christianity. Christ is the absolute revelation of God's being and character, in the light of which only all lower forms of revelation can be seen and understood in their proper significance. In Christ, in His life, His teaching, His death and His resurrection, there is revealed the whole heart of God, and in Him the grace of God has appeared, bringing salvation to all



men. God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. And the medium through which this highest revelation of God is constantly conveyed to the world is the Gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. And in relation to this supreme revelation of God's love and grace, now also men are under probation; as they are required to appropriate this grace by a free act of faith, and as God can not force it upon them against their consent, however much and earnestly He may urge them by His word and Spirit to accept it.

Or may we suppose that, in any case, the probation may be cut short before this supreme trial is reached, and the effort of saving any one on the part of God abandoned before the highest means of salvation, the Gospel of Christ, has been applied? In other words, may we suppose that any soul can develop a fixed character before it has had a chance to determine itself consciously in relation to Christ? The answer to this question will depend upon the meaning which we give to the incarnation of God, and upon the way in which we define the relation of the person of Christ to humanity. It is plain that probation cannot be ended until the soul has been brought in contact with every form of good for which there is any aptitude in its nature. Or to express the same thought in another form: it is plain that the divine work of human training and salvation cannot, in any case, be abandoned as a failure until every means has been tried which, in its relation to the soul, may be adapted to produce a favorable result. A pupil is not dismissed from school merely because one, and that the simplest and rudest, means of discipline has failed; for another may be more successful. A good teacher will exhaust all the resources of school economy before he will give up a pupil as incorrigible. And so the divine Teacher will exhaust every resource in the economy of His wisdom and love before He abandons a soul as a reprobate and irredeemable sinner. Is Christianity included in this economy? Is Christ, with His Gospel of grace, adapted to the wants of humanity? Is there an aptitude in the constitution of the human soul, and in the constitu-

tion of humanity as a whole, for Christ, and for the grace, the truth, the love and the life which are manifested in Him? Is Christianity the necessary complement of humanity?

It would seem that the answer to these questions ought not to be hard to find. In the New Testament Christ is represented as the spiritual head of humanity, yea, the Head of the whole spiritual universe, in whom, unto a dispensation of the fulness of the times, the Father eternally purposed to sum up all things. He is the universal man, embodying the whole idea of humanity—the *pleroma* of humanity as well as of divinity. He is the Son of Man, the chiefest product of all developments in the natural life of humanity, and the Second Adam, the Father or progenitor of the whole race as renewed in the Spirit and advanced unto eternal life. He stands thus in organic relation with every human being, and no man's life and character could be complete without an ethical apprehension of this relation. Christianity, accordingly, is not merely a religion—one among many, though it might be the best; but it is the absolute and universal religion of humanity. The Gospel must be preached to every creature. The view is, therefore, meeting with increasing favor among the profoundest thinkers, that the coming of Christ was not contingent, as depending on the accident of sin, but had its necessary ground in the nature of God and in the eternal idea of humanity. The incarnation would have taken place even if there had been no sin; for the realization of the highest good could not have been conditioned by the intervention of evil. Even apart from sin, which is something that, as an actuality, God could never have willed, there would have been a necessity for Christ, who, as the spiritual head of humanity, its supreme prophet, priest and king, should bring its development to completion in the glorious organization of the kingdom of God. No individual human being, therefore, even if it were sinless, could fulfill its destiny, or realize the end of its existence, without, by an ethical act, entering into right spiritual relation to Christ. But if this be true, then no one's character can be fixed before he has com-

mitted that supreme ethical act of determining himself in relation to Christ. The probation in Paradise, and the probation involved in the conditions of natural human life, are not final and decisive for any one.

But even if Christianity were only a remedial system, a plan or method merely to make good the defect of sin, we cannot see that the conclusion, so far as probation is concerned, would be essentially different. If the remedy is universal in its intent and power, and if the application of it involves any probation at all, then certainly the probation could, in no single case, be ended before the remedy has been tried. This conclusion could only be disputed by those who deny one or both of these conditions. If humanity is supposed to be merely a mass of perdition, already resting under the sentence of condemnation, and if out of this mass a certain number only are supposed to be saved by the execution of an inscrutable decree of sovereign grace, electing them to salvation and leaving others to perish, then all disputes concerning probation ought to cease; for then there is no longer any probation. If, however, God desires the salvation of all men; if Christianity be a remedial system, universal in its intent and aim; if Christ tasted death for every man; if the Gospel is for every creature, and if men, notwithstanding their fallen state, are still capable of moral acts, then we think the conclusion is obvious, that no one's chance of salvation is destroyed, and, consequently, no one's probation ended, until the remedy has been fairly tried, or the offer of salvation in Christ effectively presented through the proclamation of the Gospel. There can be no settled character, no confirmation in righteousness, and no fixedness in sin, until there has been a decided acceptance or rejection of the highest good for which there is an aptitude in the soul. Those who pass out of this life, as the great majority of mankind still do, without having become acquainted with the Gospel, as they have had no chance to determine themselves at all in relation to that highest good, have therefore not yet had their final and decisive trial, and this must consequently be waiting for them

still in some future state of existence. Their character and destiny are not yet fixed, and they are as yet neither saved nor lost.

Without Christ there certainly can be no salvation. This is distinctly declared by St. Peter in the presence of the rulers of Israel: "There is salvation in none other: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." There was a time, indeed, when, in spite of the received doctrine of original sin, the possibility of salvation without Christ was not absolutely denied, but in some sense at least affirmed. It was believed, to be sure, that the great mass of the heathen are damned; but it was admitted, nevertheless, that a few individuals here and there might be saved, like Socrates, Aristides, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and perhaps a few others. And the salvation of these few favored individuals was not supposed to be connected particularly with the mediation of Christ and the operation of His Spirit, but to be the result rather of some moral virtue or power for good still inhering in human nature, which, after its utmost exertion, might deserve to be treated with special divine indulgence. A few passages of Scripture could be interpreted in this sense. St. Peter, for instance, says that "God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to Him" (Acts 10, 14). And St. Paul declares that "God will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life: but . . . wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first and also of the Greek, . . . for there is no respect of persons with God" (Rom. 2: 4-11). According to this, then, it might be supposed to be possible for some few individuals at least, perhaps one out of a hundred millions, to become so good and just as to be saved by their own merits, especially if, in consideration of their want of perfect light and knowledge, God would relax something of the strictness of the claims of absolute justice. And this salvation of a few individuals without the

grace of Christ would serve the excellent object of showing to all the rest that they are justly condemned; for what these few accomplished, all should and could have accomplished. But it would also prove that Christ is not the only and exclusive Saviour of the world, and that St. Paul was in error when he taught that "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Gal: 2, 16). In truth, however, the passages referred to prove nothing of the kind. For Cornelius, of whom St. Peter is speaking, was not saved without Christ, but had the Gospel preached to him and was baptized; and St. Paul concludes the section from which the above quotation is made by saying that all, both Jews and Greeks, will be rewarded according to their works, in the day when God will judge the secrets of men by *Jesus Christ according to his Gospel*. But a judgment by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel, implies a previous knowledge of the Gospel and acquaintance with Christ. The passage proves that the Jew will have no advantage over the Gentile, but that ultimately the salvation of both will depend upon the character produced and works wrought in consequence of their enjoyment of the grace of Christ, and not at all that the required character and necessary works are possible without Christ. Both passages are satisfied if we suppose that those who work righteousness, and by well-doing seek for glory and immortality—a thing which, according to a truer construction of the doctrine of hereditary sin, is possible for all heathen—will be rewarded by having offered to them, either in this life or in the future, the Gospel of the Christian salvation. And, indeed, it is now generally acknowledged that, however a few passages of Scripture may be explained, St. Peter was right in teaching that there is salvation in none other than Jesus Christ.

But while it is commonly admitted that there is no salvation without Christ, it is maintained sometimes that the heathen essentially have Christ, even in this life. While they are ignorant of the historical Christ and of the Gospel, it is said, they have the *essential Christ*, and that, if they are faithful, is sufficient for their salvation. Just what is meant by this expression by those

who use it is not always clear. Of course it could not be supposed to mean that the heathen are able, by the light of nature, to discover the essential facts of the Gospel, the incarnation, work, suffering, death and resurrection of Christ, or that these facts are supernaturally made known to them by some occult operation of the Holy Spirit. But it may be understood to mean that they have the light of reason and conscience, a light kindled by participation in the eternal Reason or Logos, which in the fullness of time became incarnate in Jesus Christ; and that by means of this light they are able to distinguish between right and wrong in human conduct, and especially to discern the prime obligation of love to man—that *philanthropy* which, according to the Gospel, forms the fundamental law of divine judgment. This is no new thought. It meets us already in Justin Martyr and in Clement of Alexandria. "We have been taught," says Justin, "that Christ is the first-born of God, and we have before declared that He is the Logos (universal reason) of whom every race of men were partakers; and those who lived according to reason (*μετὰ λόγου*) are *Christians*, even though they have been regarded as atheists."\* And even the stern Tertullian, who so distinctly teaches that men are not *born* but *made* Christians, nevertheless, when he thinks of the mind's natural aptitude for the truths of the Gospel exclaims that the soul is *by nature* Christian.† Such men, then, it may be said, as live truly according to the light of nature, which, in fact, is nothing else than the light of the divine Logos still shining in the darkness of the world, are, without knowing it, followers of Christ, and must be supposed to participate somehow in the benefit of the atonement, and to be subject to the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit. Those who think of the atonement as a legal satisfaction of divine justice by the vicarious suffering of Christ, and regard it as universal in its sufficiency and aim, will have no trouble in supposing that such heathen as live honestly and according to the light of

\* 1 Apol. 46, Cf. Chap. 5; and 2 Apol. 8, 10, 13.

† Apologeticus 17.

nature, are at once, when they die, saved by the merits of Christ. "Whenever a human being is found, as a matter-of-fact, to be reconciled to God," says Dr. A. A. Hodge, "and by a holy life gives evidence of possessing a holy nature, we with perfect confidence attribute the result to the application to the person in question of the expiating virtue of Christ's sacrifice and of the regenerating power of His Spirit."\* An example of such holy life is then recognized in the case of the late Sir Moses Montefiore, who is supposed to have been *essentially* a Christian, though he never confessed Christ in his life, and in fact could only have thought of Him, if he thought of Him at all, as an impostor. But if it is possible for some heathens and some Jews to be essentially Christians without knowing it, then it is possible for all; and so all have their decisive probation in this life, because they have the light of nature, which is thus essentially the Gospel itself.

We believe that there is a great truth in this view of an essential relation of Christ to mankind universally, but that the conclusion here deduced from this relation is decidedly erroneous. That there is truth in it will appear from a very brief study of heathenism. The heathen are capable of moral judgment, and possess moral sensibilities. In the higher stages of civilization at least they distinguish with much accuracy between right and wrong, as witness the writings of Plato and Aristotle. They also have a sense of God and a feeling of worship. While the heathen have not the truth as a whole, there is nevertheless much religious and moral truth to be met with in heathenism. Essentially the same moral virtues that are required in the Gospel are also insisted on in the writings of Buddhism, even to the forgiving of injuries and the loving of enemies.† And as to the worship of heathenism, this is not all mere senseless idolatry. There is real worship in heathenism, and real devotion to the true God, in whom all live and move and have their being. The primi-

\* Article in *The Independent*, Sept. 17, 1885.

† Comp. *Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. I., p. 218.



tive Romans invoked the deity in the same endearing terms which we still use in the Lord's prayer;\* and St. Paul told the Athenians that they ignorantly worshipped the very God whom he was about to make known to them. "What therefore ye worship in ignorance this I set forth unto you." These facts need not be denied or ignored in order to enhance the value and glory of Christianity. The modern comparative study of religions has enabled us to form a truer conception of the nature and meaning of heathenism than was possible before. Heathenism is a preparation for Christianity as really as Judaism. We used to be told that heathenism is a *negative* preparation for Christianity, while Judaism was said to be a *positive* preparation. It is, however, more than that. Before the coming of Christ, the heathen were not merely left to themselves, forsaken of God, groping in utter darkness, and ineffectually seeking after God and salvation, and then at last, by the discipline of disappointment, led to despair of the possibility of self-deliverance, and thus reduced to a willingness to accept the Gospel when it should come. There was something more positive than this in the life of ancient heathenism—a working of forces whose direct tendency was towards Christ and Christianity. Christ is the Son of Man, of humanity, and not merely the Son of Judaism. We need only to think of the service rendered to Christianity by the development of Greek thought and of Roman law, in order to perceive that the object of heathenism must have been something more positive than merely the conviction of the human mind of its own impotence in the sphere of religion and morality.† And there is something

\**Jupiter*, the name of the Supreme Latin God, comes from the old Aryan root *dyu* or *dyaus*, found in Sanscrit in the sense of *sky* or *heaven*, and *pitar*, *pater*, *father*. Jupiter is *father in heaven*, or *heavenly father*. The Greek *Zeús*, gen. *Διός*, is from the same root, and *Zeús πατήρ* is *heaven-father*. This is not merely an interesting fact in the science of language, but also of religion, as it affords us a glimpse into the primitive working of the religious mind. Cf. Max Müller, *Science of Language*, Second Series, p. 444, sq.

†Speaking of philosophy, Clement of Alexandria says: "This was a schoolmaster to bring the Hellenic mind, as the law, the Hebrews, to



more than that in modern heathenism. The life of universal humanity has been touched by the fact of the incarnation of God, and the influence of this must be felt by the remotest members of the race; and the activity of the Spirit of the Father drawing to the Son is doubtless exerted everywhere in connection with the events of nature and history. So then Christ is virtually and essentially related to the whole race of mankind, and this relation profoundly affects its whole spiritual condition. "The race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it." \*

But from all this it does not follow that heathenism offers sufficient knowledge and grace for salvation, and that the heathen, therefore, have their decisive probation in the present life. It may be regarded as a proof that the heathen are not as such cast off and damned, but not that heathenism is in substance the same as Christianity. If heathenism could do for its votaries all that historical Christianity can do for believers, and if, therefore, it were Christianity *essentially*, then conversely Christianity would essentially be only a form of heathenism, or of natural religion—one only, though perhaps the best, of the great religions of the world, and between it and these there would be no essential difference.† The fact that heathenism is a preparation for Christianity does not make it essentially equal to Christianity in respect of motive and power for salvation. The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but heathenism, whatever else it may be, is not the Gospel. No one doubts that Judaism was a preparation for Christianity; and yet even Judaism was not in any sense Christianity. Judaism was a product of special divine revelation, far transcending the meas-

Christ. Philosophy, therefore, was a preparation, paving the way for him who is perfected in Christ."—*Stromata* I. V. Again: "To the Jews be longed the Law, and to the Greeks Philosophy, until the Advent."—*Stromata* VI. XVII.

\* *Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 52.

† *Cf. Progressive Orthodoxy*, p. 90.

ure of any revelation extant in heathenism. It stood in the central current of the movement of the divine life towards its incarnation in Christ. The Jews were in possession of special promises. But they had not yet attained to the realization of those promises. The Christ had not yet come. The redemption was not yet actually accomplished. The highest good was not yet manifested. And hence the salvation and probation of the Jews who died before the advent of Christ, were not yet finished. The idea that the Jew could have the historical or real Christ present to his faith, beholding Him, for instance, in the sacrifices and other institutions of the law, so that his faith would have been *essentially* the same as that of the Christian, we regard merely as an idle fancy. We are distinctly told that even the most eminent believers of the Old Testament dispensation in their day, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning those of the New Testament dispensation, that the former should not be made perfect apart from the latter (Heb. 11 : 39, 40). But if this be true of Judaism, how much more must it be true of heathenism ?

In some sense Christ is doubtless immanent in the life and history of heathen nations ; but how insufficient this is for their salvation is manifest from the fact that, without contact with historical Christianity, the heathen never rise to the true knowledge of God, or flourish in those virtues which are declared to be the fruits of the Spirit of Christ. A comparison of Gal. 5 : 22 with Rom. 1 : 24-32 will be sufficient to show us the immense difference between Christianity and heathenism in this regard. In some sense it may be admitted that Christ is immanent in the soul of every man. If it be true that in God we live and move and have our being, this must be true especially of that Hypostasis of the Godhead, through whose mediation all things exist. But the immanent presence of Christ in the soul does not work towards salvation naturally and spontaneously, like a law of nature. Salvation is not a natural, but an ethical process. The Christ, as the embodiment of the highest good, must be presented to the mind in such way that

He may become to it an object of deliberate choice or of conscious self-determination. There is need thus for the Gospel, presenting to the mind the historical Christ as an object of faith and knowledge, in order that there may be developed an actual *sense* of Christ immanent in the soul. In other words, the immanent or essential Christ must be met by the transcendent or historical Christ in order to the realization of salvation as an ethical process. And hence Peter says that there is not any other *name* under heaven, given among men wherein they may be saved (Acts 4: 12). The name here, as always, stands for the person *revealed*; not merely for the conception of an immanent or essential Christ, but for the historical Christ. No man is saved until he has by a conscious act of faith apprehended the real Christ *revealed* to the eye of his soul.

What shall we say then concerning the countless multitudes who in all ages have died without having had Christ thus revealed to them? Shall we say that, because they could not have been actually saved in the present life, they must all have perished? Such an opinion might be agreeable to the principles of Augustinian theology, or of supralapsarian Calvinism; for according to the one it might be said that perdition is only the doom which all men have deserved in consequence of the guilt of original sin, while according to the other it might be said that God has a perfect right to consign as many men to perdition as He pleases, because He is their Creator and can do with them what He likes. A pantheistic theology, ignorant of the true significance of personality whether appertaining to God or to man, might likewise concur in this opinion. For if men are merely specimens of the genus, or hap-hazard productions of the blind world process in its endless and aimless motion, then it matters not how many individuals may perish, for the genus or race will still be safe. In nature a great many possibilities are never realized. Many a bud never develops into flower or fruit, and many an animal is born that never grows to maturity and thus fails to fulfil the idea of its being. And this is a fact that we do not much lay to heart or mourn

over. It violates no ethical principle, and no sentiment of humanity. Why then should we hesitate much to adopt the opinion that it matters little if the great majority of mankind do perish, provided only that the elect, or "those who have been given to Christ in the covenant," are saved? Would not this be another evidence of the "application of natural law in the spiritual world?" But however plausible this may sound, the Christian consciousness can never give its assent to such a doctrine. According to the Christian conception of God, He is love—not a blind force, nor an arbitrary sovereign, but a person whose chief quality is love; and every human being is a person, originating in a distinct thought begotten of the divine love; and therefore possesses an infinite value both for itself and for God. God can, therefore, not be indifferent to the salvation of even a single individual, much less can He suffer countless millions to perish without giving them the slightest chance of being saved.

The harshness of this thought of the general destruction of the heathen is, in our opinion, not much mitigated by the supposition of the salvation of all infants and idiots. Probably one half of the human race die in infancy, and these, it is said, are surely all saved; so that, remembering that at least some adults also are saved, the number of the saved is still greater than the number of the damned. And this latter number is still further diminished, as there are many persons who have not mind enough to be responsible for their conduct, and who therefore also are supposed to be saved beyond any peradventure. "*O terque quaterque beati*," one might therefore exclaim in regard to these departing infants and idiots, who pass at once from this earth into the bliss of heaven, while the friends and benefactors who feed them and care for them here, are inevitably doomed to perdition because they die without the knowledge of the gospel! But on what ground do men so confidently assert the salvation of all infants and idiots? How are they supposed to be saved, if there is no possibility of probation after this life? Are they saved without probation?

Is their salvation accomplished without any ethical process, and without any ethical means? How then is the hereditary moral corruption with which they are born eliminated from their nature, and how do they obtain the perfect moral character which alone befits the glory and blessedness of heaven? Is this the result merely of some magical operation on the part of God? But if God, by such magic, can save one half of the human race, why can He not also save the other half in the same way? We may be reminded, indeed, that sanctification is the work of the Holy Spirit; but, as we understand it, this work is not brought to pass without the conscious and free co-operation of the human will—in other words, it is an ethical work, taking place in the will itself under the influence of appropriate motives. Or it may be said that those who pass out of this life in a state of unconsciousness, without having committed any actual sins, come at once into the society and under the fostering care of holy angels, under whose tuition and training they will infallibly develop a holy character. The question might then be asked, why, if all depends upon the superior advantages of angelic training, similar advantages are not also afforded to men who live and develop their character in this world? Whence this partiality? The supposition, however, may be granted; but even then, unless we think of the formation of character as merely a natural and not an ethical process, we still have probation after death, necessarily involving the possibility of alternative choice in relation to the supreme moral good.

Objection is made to this view sometimes that it is not expressly taught in Scripture. No plain "thus saith the Lord," can be quoted in favor of it. But it is claimed that, though it may not be "expressly set down in Scripture," it may "by good and necessary consequence be deduced from Scripture." It is believed that what the Bible teaches concerning the character of God, concerning the nature and personality of man, concerning the significance of the incarnation, and concerning the conditions of salvation, necessarily involves it. If

God desires the salvation of all men, if Christ proposes to be a universal Saviour, and if salvation can only be actualized by personal faith in Christ, then the inference would seem to be plain, that those who in this life are not favored with the conditions of faith, will be favored with these conditions hereafter. The word of Christ by which faith comes, will be brought to them in another life. But it is believed, further, that this view is directly involved in what the Bible teaches concerning the *intermediate state*. It is the uniform teaching of the Bible that the state of existence into which the soul enters at death is not its final state. That only begins with the resurrection and the last judgment. The Old Testament represents the souls of the departed as existing in Sheol, and as being in a condition that is neither perfect misery nor perfect happiness.\* The redemption had not yet actually come, and the faithful were still waiting to be made perfect. When Christ died, He descended into Hades, and "preached unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3: 19). He then personally presented himself to the dwellers in Hades as the vanquisher of sin and the destroyer of death, and this presentation was for them a probation, as it involved the necessity of either accepting or rejecting Him as their deliverer. But, as Dorner has observed, the cessation of this preaching of the Gospel in Hades, then commenced by Christ, is neither recorded in Scripture, nor can it reasonably be supposed.† It will be continued, as long as there are unsaved but salvable souls there.

But if the doctrine of future probation cannot be dogmatically established by texts of Scripture neither can it be dogmatically refuted. No plain "thus saith the Lord" can be brought forward in opposition to it. The passages that are usually quoted against it, for the purpose of refutation, such as 2 Cor.

\* It may perhaps hardly be necessary to state that it is not supposed that the souls of *Christians*, or of the Old Testament saints, exist in this condition *now*. They are with Christ in felicity, although their bliss is not yet perfect. Cf. Phil. 1: 23, and Rev. 14: 13.

† *Future State*, Translated by Newman Smyth, p. 153.

5: 10, and Heb. 9: 27, as has often been demonstrated, really prove nothing. They are simply irrelevant. The first passage just referred to relates only to Christians, who have the Gospel in this life, and does not say that they will be judged *only* according to the things done in the body, but merely that each one will receive the things done in the body. And in the second passage we are not told *how soon* after death the judgment comes. That it does not come *immediately* after death is plain from the whole teaching of the New Testament. The New Testament knows nothing of an occult or secret judgment passed upon the soul immediately after death, which is only to be openly reaffirmed in the final judgment of the world. Such a view would rob the final judgment of its real significance. The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus would cause difficulty only if it were supposed that the possibility of conversion continues after death in the case of all men without exception. But this is not the meaning of the theory. The theory assumes that, under the influence of sufficient knowledge and motive, character may become fixed in the present life, and that that, if it be evil, will be an impassable barrier to salvation in the future. Only where the conditions of developing a fixed character are wanting in the present life, will the possibility of salvation extend over into the future.

But will not this theory prove fatal to missions? Not any more than the theory of salvation through the "essential Christ," or the fantastic notion of probation in the moment of death. There is, however, no danger in either view. The truth is that the real motive for missions is not in the belief of the damnation of the heathen, but in the love of Christ. The periods in the history of the Church during which the perdition of the heathen was most firmly believed in, were the most barren in missionary work. This may seem strange. It may be remarked, in the way of explanation, that such belief perhaps never amounts to a real vital conviction. The genial Farrar observes somewhere that any man who has imagination and feeling enough to *realize* the thought of the eternal damna-



tion of any number of men, will find it very difficult to believe in it. The question is whether the *realization* of such a thought would not rather drive one mad, than make him a missionary. Or the effect of such a thought might be to paralyze the work of missions in another way. It might be said that if the heathen perish, it must be because God has so decreed. If He wanted them to be saved He would convert them; and if He does not want them to be saved, we must not think of interfering with His purposes. The supreme motive for the work of missions consists in the love of Christ and in the firm conviction of the universality of the Christian salvation. This was the motive in the mind of St. Paul for beseeching men to be reconciled to God. "The love of Christ," he says, "constraineth us, who judge thus: because one died for all, therefore all died. And He died for all, that they which live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who for their sakes died and rose again." But a subordinate motive, though we think a very strong one, for earnestness in missionary work may be found in the temporal blessings conferred upon the heathen by their Christianization. The object of Christianity is not merely to save men in the world to come, but also to elevate and ennoble them in this world. Godliness has promise of the world which now is, as well as of that which is to come. And who that thinks of the countless miseries that weigh upon the life of the heathen in this world, should not be earnestly desirous of their conversion? Besides, the conversion of the heathen is a necessary condition of the ultimate perfection of the Church, and of the final consummation of our own salvation. The Gospel must be preached to every nation, the fullness of the Gentiles must come in, and Israel must be converted, before the Lord can come to finish the work of our redemption through the resurrection and glorification of the judgment. Here, then, surely there remain motives enough for earnest missionary work, though we suppose the probation of the heathen and their chance for salvation to be prolonged after death.



But if we admit an extension of the possibility of salvation beyond death in the case of the heathen, must we not then do so also in the case of many in Christian lands, and perhaps even in the case of some nominal Christians themselves? No doubt many die, even here, whose spiritual character has not become fixed. They have neither decidedly rejected Christ, nor accepted Him and become conformed to His image. This may be partly their own fault, and it may in part be the fault also of a careless, formal, cold or lukewarm Church. What shall be said of such cases? It cannot be supposed that the mere fact of physical death is itself a completion of moral character. The man who is not holy the moment before his death, cannot be holy the next moment after death; and yet without holiness no man shall see the Lord. But so also, on the other hand, one who has not committed the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit the moment before he leaves the body, will not have committed it the next moment after. In such cases the ethical process, and along with this also the fact of probation, must necessarily be supposed to be continued in the spiritual realm. The degree of uncertainty attaching to the issue may be diminished in proportion to the advancement of the moral process at the moment of death, but it cannot become absolutely nothing until the process has become complete in a fixed character. In the case of sincere Christians, whose faith is a living reality, we may be practically sure that, though they may not be perfect in sanctity at the moment of death, they will go on unto perfection afterwards. The salvation of such may, therefore, be positively affirmed without any hesitation. But of many who bear the Christian name this is not possible. They have not made such progress in the Christian life as to enable one to say that their salvation is an assured fact. And yet no one would dare to say that they are damned, for they are not so bad as to justify such a judgment in the forum of Christian consciousness. In such cases there is a welcome relief in the doctrine of an extension of probation after death. The fate of such is not yet decided, and their probation not

ended. In many cases it would be better, on prudential grounds, plainly to say this, than vaguely to indulge the "hope" of salvation, because God is merciful, or because perhaps the departed possessed some generous traits of character. If some might possibly wrest this truth to their own destruction, there are others doubtless who wrest that "hope" to their own destruction.

It must be remembered, however, that the theory presented in this paper does not imply that there is probation for *all* men after death. It teaches that the limit of probation is subjective, rather than objective. Not by any moment of time, either before or after death, is the limit of probation determined, but by the formation of a fixed character, and that may be reached before death as well as after. It is not a *second* probation that awaits men after death. Those who have had their decisive trial in this life, will have no other trial hereafter. Of course God only can know what constitutes a decisive trial. How much light, how much knowledge, and how much motive are required for each individual soul, in order to enable it to accept Christ and to develop a Christian character, God only can know. And He will take care that there is sufficient for each one either here or hereafter. Those who have the Gospel here in its fulness and purity, have all the conditions requisite in order to a decisive probation, and for them, if they wilfully reject Christ here, there will be no probation hereafter. It is in this light that the theory should be presented, if it is presented at all, by the pulpit. The preacher may not often have occasion to enforce the truth that for some the time of probation may be prolonged after death, but he will constantly have occasion to warn men that, if they wilfully resist the truth in the present moment, the time of their probation may be ended long before they come to die. The key on which the preaching of this doctrine should be pitched is to be found in the text: "Behold, *now* is the acceptable time; behold, *now* is the day of salvation." And again: "*To-day* if ye shall hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

## VI.

### THE ELECTION AND REPROBATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D.D.

ANY system of Theology, or phase of Religious thought, which lays Divine Sovereignty as its chief corner-stone, rather than Divine Charity, will have a dynamic instead of a moral basis; will so expand Divine Power as to overshadow human Freedom, in its structure; will so place, *in relieve*, Divine decrees as the principal lines of its formation, as to limit the movements of individual will; and will be so strongly wind-swept by the element of Divine Destiny as to stifle the breath of personal Responsibility.

It is the aim of these pages to establish, on the sure Word of God, a series of propositions which set forth the Plan of Redemption as resting on the foundation of Divine Righteousness throughout, *to wit*: That God wills the Salvation of Mankind; that Jesus Christ was made man, lived, suffered and died, descended into Hades, rose again and ascended to God in His glorified Humanity,—all this for the Redemption of the Human Race; that God foreordained Mankind unto Eternal Life; that Mankind predestinates itself unto Eternal Death, solely in consequence of its own disobedience, wickedness or malice; and, that all men must exert themselves in order to obtain so great Salvation.

Holy Scripture affords us such a mass of "proof-texts," in support of these gladsome positions, as to render it quite a task merely to select the most striking and convincing ones from the long catalogue. We need but note those most familiar and

directly exponential of the general tenor of the Divine Record: —“Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?” (Ezekiel xvii. 23). “As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel!” (chap. xxxiii. 2). “O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thy help!” (Hosea xiii. 9).

In the New Testament we cannot move so as to avoid the clearest and most positive declarations of God's will, that all men might be saved. Texts and contexts are alike loud and unequivocal. The “ninety and nine” are left in the fold even, that the hundredth, too, may be rescued. The cry of the Baptist is pressed from our souls by but a casual glance at our Lord: “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!” The Son of Man affirms, without any reservation, that He “came not to destroy, but to save.” His significant name, JESUS, tells us the meaning of His gracious Mission to the World. “It is not God's will,” we are assured, “that one of the least of these little ones should perish.”

St. Peter writes, that the Lord is “so long-suffering to us-ward,” because He is “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance” (2d Ep. iii. 9). St. John says, that “he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world” (1st Ep. ii. 3). St. Paul exhorts Timothy to have “supplications, prayers, intercessions and giving of thanks made for all men; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth, through the man Christ Jesus, who gave Himself a ransom for all” (1st Ep. ii. 1-6). Both Sts. Peter and Paul emphasize the parity of mankind, and declare that “with God there is no respect of persons.” (Compare Romans ii. 11 with Col. iii. 25; 1st Peter i. 17).

But why continue to perform what must seem like a work of supererogation? It is not questioned that the gospel presents

salvation as a prize, for which all may and ought to strive, and ever with the sure hope of obtaining it.

The word of God preaches on its face, everywhere and throughout, *the Divine Predestination of Mankind unto Eternal Life*.

We proceed, then, to adduce and examine those declarations of Holy Scripture which seem to imply and teach the doctrine of a Reprobation unto Eternal Death, as well. As these texts help to form the so-called "Contradictions of the Bible," they are well worth examination, we think. They constitute the sceptic's "stock-in-trade," and perplex, not seldom, the minds of earnest Christians.

One would naturally suppose, that whenever or wherever a mass of cumulative testimony holds the field, as against certain isolated facts and instances which appear to militate against the body of evidence, the first inference or assumption would be, *not* a contradiction, but a misunderstanding or mistaken view, of such apparent antagonistic exceptions to the universal rule. The logician's conviction is confirmed by exceptions, we are taught, rather than shaken.

Our theme confines us to that entire series of Scriptural phrases which verge on Election and Reprobation: to those which proclaim, on the one hand, Free Grace for Mankind, and seemingly and sparsely only, declare a Foreordination of a class unto Eternal Perdition, on the other. It is *this* antithesis alone that concerns us just now.

When St. Peter (1st Ep. ii. 8) speaks of a certain order as "being disobedient, *whereunto* also they were called," ought we to read on its face, first and most readily, the doctrine that God "called" those souls to be "disobedient," unbelievers and reprobates, and so, by one stroke, as it were, wipe out all the scores of Divine sayings which tells us directly to the contrary? Rather than impeach the integrity of the Sacred Text, and thereby assist the unbeliever to convict it of maintaining two opposite and contrary propositions, it is the first duty and delight of the believer and seeker after the Truth, surely, to assume and es-

tablish a reconciliation. Ought not such a possibility, at least, be taken for granted, and the task be considered imperative, first and foremost? Why not, then, immediately inquire whether St. Peter's saying, in this place, cannot be read in such a way as naturally and easily to harmonize with all that he has said elsewhere and everywhere else? Without doing the least violence, either to the laws of Grammar or of Grace, we may believe him to speak of that class "which stumble at the word (Gospel); being disobedient to that to which they were called." "Called" to what? To the Word, evidently, to which they had shown themselves "disobedient," even an Erasmus makes the "*Whereunto*" relate to the "*Word*," rather than to being "*disobedient*." Is this sense not its full value?

It remains for those, who would still have this pillar to help bear up the dogma of a Divine Reprobation, to prove that this saying *must* have such a gloomy version read into itself; whilst it is fully sufficient for us to know that a better rendering lies nearer; such a rendering as will harmonize it at once with all that the good apostle has written beside.

St. Jude seems, according to the popular and common reading, to teach a direct and positive Reprobation (v. 4): "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation; ungodly men, turning the Grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Truth to tell, this sounds strange! And to have been written, too, by one who in the same connection writes about a "*common salvation*" (ver. 6)!

But the Revised Version even reads: "They who were of old *set forth*," not "foreordained." And the Douay Version reads, "Who were *written of* long ago." Evidently, then, St. Jude means to say, that there would come heretics, who had been previously, of old, or long ago, foretold; and so he takes away all excuse for false teachers to creep in "unawares," since they had been so fully and plainly described. Forewarned, all might be forearmed, too.

Proverbs xvii. 4 is eagerly seized on, as a sure support to

the dismal dogma of an unconditional, Divine Decree unto Perdition, of a large class. We are asked to believe, without any debate or doubting, that God created the "wicked" for the sole purpose of holding them against the evil day. We cannot prove so facile a pupil. We cannot but believe that "the wish is father to the thought," with those that would read this meaning into the Proverb. It strikes us as a clear case of special pleading in favor of a preconceived theory. For us it is easy to think, that everything and all persons will at last vindicate God's Glory, saints and sinners. Even the wicked, when enduring the consequences of their own folly and malice, will prove the fixidity and righteousness of His Character and the Moral Law? And is there anything more than that meant to be taught? Vatable renders it thus: "The Lord hath made everything for Himself; and even the wicked will fall into the evil day." Grotius reads it: "There is such a wise arrangement and correspondence in good things, but also in evil things; for the evil punishment follows the evil of guilt; the evil day is appointed for the evil doer." To say that God and God's Covenant will be fully vindicated, notwithstanding the existence of Sin and Sinners, is one thing; a perfectly reasonable maxim. But to teach that God creates sin and sinners, in order to glorify Himself, is to predicate of God the grossest injustice and cruelty. And every soul that would not itself think of God otherwise than in the fairest light of love and kindness, or have others to think of our Heavenly Father in a different way, must breathe a sigh of relief when it finds that no such incubus at all is laid on the Divine Being, on the authority of His own Word. St. Peter, in his Pentecostal Sermon, uses this language: "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders and signs, which God did by Him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know; Him, *being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God*, ye have taken, and by wicked hands crucified and slain; Whom God hath raised

up, having loosed the pains of death ; because it was not possible that He should be holden of it " (Acts ii. 22-3-4).

From this fearful saying all are asked, by some, to believe that the crime and guilt of Christ's crucifixion and torturous martyrdom, had all been *ordained* by "the determinate counsel" of God. The "determinate counsel" of God is made to be exactly commensurate with His "foreknowledge." No one will, likely, dispute the fact, that God's "foreknowledge" embraced all the Humiliation and Exaltation of Christ's History. God was not surprised at all by any movement made by Satan or Satan's menials, surely. Nor is it difficult to credit, still further, that God's "determinate counsel" was the spring and source of Christ's Incarnation, Life, Sufferings, Dying, Burial, Resurrection and Ascension to Heaven in a glorified Humanity. It was God Who "delivered" His Son to the World, in this sense, by His "determinate counsel," verily. By what other "counsel" could such an "unspeakable Gift" have been conceived and donated ?

Had God's "foreknowledge" not taken Christ's entire history into view, the Prophets would not have 'so, in detail, marked Him out in advance. And that "God so loved the World that He gave ('delivered') His only-begotten Son, that whosoever," &c., is not questioned by any one who has a right to call himself orthodox. This St. Peter loudly preaches. But, mark how sharply the bold apostle turns from the *grand and loving part which God did*, in His "determinate counsel," to the *wretched, insane and devilish part which His own countrymen did!* "YE have taken, and with wicked hands have crucified and slain Him Whom God had so kindly 'delivered' to the world!" God is given all the glory, since all that was grand and good in the history of Jesus was of His "determinate counsel;" but all the shame, sin and guilt that had entered into Christ's life, are cast on the consciences of the Jews. What God had so mercifully "delivered" for the Redemption of Mankind, they took and with "wicked (not 'fated') hands crucified and slew."

It is sometimes thought, that however mysterious the mar-



tyrdom of Christ may strike us, still, in some way, it must be said that Pilate and Herod, the High Priests and Priests, Jewish Leaders and the rabble, as well as Judas,—all these were, at last, made to do what they did; that all this "was to be so." Regardless of the conclusion that must immediately follow, that Jews and Gentiles, Governors, High Priests and Priests, Scribes, Elders, Pharisees, Sadducees and Judas, are then wholly acquitted of all accountability, 'the determinate counsel' of God was the primary source of all the horrors of Calvary, it is thought." If they had not done as they did, "how could the world have been redeemed?" we are asked. And if Christ had to die as an Offering for Mankind, surely all that was had "to be so!" it is declared.

Might we not ask, however, whether there might not have been many other ways by which Christ could have "tasted death" for every man? Or, is it so self-evident that God, in His "determinate counsel," at all needed the aid and partnership of the Evil one and his servants to effect the consummation of that "tasting of death," in order that a way of salvation might be opened? We are not told that *this way to death was the only one* which God could have broken. We are told, that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission for sin;" but we are not told that such a "shedding of blood" must be made solely in that way which men must "by wicked hands" open. We are not minded at all to make God's "determinate counsel" so dependent on the malice of the devil and "wicked hands." It is far more in accordance with God's character, as portrayed in the Divine Record, that He, by His "determinate counsel," could have found the way of Redemption over which to lead Mankind, without at any time asking Satan and wicked men to aid Him in finding and opening that way.

An unprejudiced mind, or one reading for the first time the tragedy of Calvary, would, rather, fall upon the thought, that Satan and his human agents had *interfered* with God's plan, sooner than aided Him in its execution. Jesus of Nazareth, a being so young and so healthy, he would likely think, might

have lived over through many years longer, and still have broken through the gates of the Grave, and Death, and Hades, and come forth again to lead Mankind forth in His wake, after having freely given up His life for the immortality of the Race. This thought would only be cancelled in his mind, were such a novice in the history of Christ to read the Prophets, who told in advance that all this would so come to pass. He would then be obliged to credit God with a "foreknowledge," indeed; but he would not naturally conclude that all that men had done to Christ must also have been "determined" by God's "counsel." That God knew all that would take place in the history of his Son, is an easy thing to credit; but that all the sins and iniquities enacted by Satan and Satan's coadjutors, need not and ought not to be included in God's "determinate counsel." St. Peter does not so preach here, or elsewhere, nor does any other inspired writer. Even so conservative a commentator as Dr. Clarke writes of what God's "determinate counsel" did, and did not, embrace, in this way: "God had determined long before, from the foundation of the world (Rev. xiii. 8), to give His Son a Sacrifice for sin; and the treachery of Judas and the malice of the Jews were only incidental means by which the great counsel of God was fulfilled, but never *ordering* that it should be brought about by such wretched means. *This was permitted; the other was decreed.*"

Most easily can this section be harmonized with all that the Scripture saith, too. We may read,—“God so loved the world that He gave (‘delivered’) His only-begotten Son,” &c., but the Jews so hated Him that they took Him, “with wicked hands, crucified Him” and killed Him. Yet, in spite of their malice, “God raised Him up again, not suffering Him” to remain under the power of Death and so defeat the plan of Redemption which God had fixed upon in his “determinate counsel,” and every item of whose history His “foreknowledge” had taken into view already, ere any consummated act or fact had come to the surface.

In this view God's character is vindicated, and the great

crime in the history of the World is laid at the door of that Nation and People which cried out, "His blood be upon us and upon our children!" There is where St. Peter makes it to lie; and the later life of that people proves it only too plainly, that the crime was a self-imprecated one, for which God is not any more accountable than He is for any one of the thousands of murders committed in our day, though not one escaped His foreknowledge either.

In the Book of Exodus (chaps. iv. 1, xi. 12) it is twice declared: "But I will harden his heart that he shall not let the people go. And the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh." Whilst this seems direct enough, the fact that the same record (chap. viii. 15) assures us, too, that "Pharaoh hardened his heart" himself, ought, surely, incline us toward the *via media*. An additional consideration emanates from his own confession, "I have sinned this time also" (chap. ix. 15).

It is plain that God offered mercy to the infatuated King, on conditions of obedience; but these conditions not being fulfilled, God withdrew all overtures of grace, and in so far, and so far only, contributed to a hardening of Pharaoh's heart. It is well known that there is a whole cluster of Hebrew Texts which sound harsh when uttered in any modern tongue, but which the genius of that language renders perfectly euphonic. In their native speech those phrases mean that God suffered that King to harden his heart by not striving with him any longer, since all would not avail in consequence of his own malice. It is but saying of Pharaoh what is said of Ephraim, "He is joined to his idols; let him alone" (Hos. iv. 17).

We may gather many such passages from the field of Holy Scripture, every one of which would strike our ear as cruel when literally turned into our tongue. It is then that "the letter killeth," indeed. The well-known couplet of those primitive brothers, "I have *loved* Jacob and *hated* Esau" (Mal. i. 2, 3), dark as it is, when left to stand on the latter's "mountains and waste heritage for the dragons of the wilderness," becomes illuminated the moment we bring it aside of our Lord's say-

ing, "If any man come after Me, and *hate* not his father and mother," &c., "he cannot be My disciple." The Gospel forbids the cherishing of *hate*, even against an enemy, much more toward a relation. God, Who forbids hate in the heart of His children, cannot be supposed to entertain it in His own heart, either. The precept means only that His disciples must love father and mother *less* than Christ and God. In this sense Jacob *loved* Rachael more than Leah, or, *hated* Leah and loved Rachael. And in this sense only could God *hate* Esau.

As the case of the Egyptian King will confront us again, later on, we dismiss him for the time and proceed to the consideration of the section of the Ninth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, which has been called "the war-horse of Calvin." The entire section must be quoted and read, in order that this famous support to the dogma of a Predestination of some to Eternal Life and the Reprobation of others to Eternal Perdition, may be properly considered.

"For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of Him, that calleth; it was said unto her, 'The Elder shall serve the younger.' As it is written, 'Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.' What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid? For he saith to Moses, 'I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.' So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that showeth mercy. For the Scripture saith unto Pharaoh, 'Even for this purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.' Therefore hath he mercy on whom He will have mercy, and whom He will He hardeneth. Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth He yet find fault? For who hath resisted His will? Nay, but O, man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, 'Why hast thou made me thus?' Hath not the potter power over the clay, of

the same lump to make one vessel unto honour, and another unto dishonour? What if God, willing to show His wrath, and to make His power known, endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; And that He might make known the riches of His glory on vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared unto glory, even us, whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles?'"

From the surface of this famous section of God's Word some bitter fruits are constantly gathered, indeed. 1. God fore-ordained Jacob unto Eternal Life; 2. God predestinated Esau unto Eternal Perdition; 3. God decreed the one and the other, before either had done any good or evil; before either had been born, in fact; 4. The salvation of Jacob and the damnation of Esau came not in consequence of any will power, or deeds of the one or the other, but solely through a Divine Decree; 5. God shows mercy on whom He pleases, and whom He will, He hardeneth; 6. For the sole purposes of Eternal Salvation and Eternal Condemnation, men are in God's hands, as clay is in the hands of the potter; 7. God hardened the heart of Pharaoh merely to show forth His great power throughout all the earth.

It were no longer a matter of wonder, that the schools of the agnostics and skeptics should count so many pupils, if the Divine Record actually teaches such lessons. We cannot see how the Volume of Inspiration can be any longer defended as coming from an Infinitely Good Being, if rewards and punishments, life and death, are arbitrarily dealt out, without any respect whatsoever to desert. We cannot conceive what other attributes were needed, to constitute a Tyrant-Deity.

Whatever surface-crop may be reaped from this oft-reviewed field, or whatever theoretical weeds are supposed to flourish in all their rankness over the plot now under our eye, it is very evident, that *no reference at all is had to the Eternal Destiny of either Jacob or Esau*. There is not the remotest allusion made to Jacob's salvation, or to Esau's perdition. It does not pretend to give us a portrait of the *personal character* of these ancient brothers. What we know of Jacob's moral character, as well

as that of Esau's, must be learned elsewhere. We know the weaknesses and the strength of both; but these are not under review by the apostle here. There is every reason to suppose that both were men of note and possessed elements of heroism. We are warranted in saying, that the two brothers had become goodly disposed to each other. We know that Esau frankly forgave his brother Jacob, and sincerely pardoned him for all that the latter had done against him. The pathetic fact, that when Isaac died and was buried, "his two sons, Esau and Jacob, buried him," affords us ground to believe that their reconciliation was of a permanent character. Any one who reads the xxxiii. chapter of Exodus, and remembers the deep-rootedness of family feuds, will not think quite meanly of Esau's heart, or pronounce him an unfit subject for the Kingdom of God; more especially so, since it is supposed, too, that he was the ancestor of holy Job. Esau was not excluded from the Kingdom of God, or had not forfeited his right to Eternal Life, though he was rejected from the high position of being the *Head of the Nation of God's People*. As Ishmael had not been eternally condemned, though he too was not made a Chief, so neither is it anywhere intimated, that Esau suffered in Eternity, in consequence of his displacement from that position to which his birth-right had originally entitled him.

St. Paul was continually met by the argument, that Christianity could not be the true Religion, since "Salvation is of the Jews." Hence, the apostles speak expressly and exclusively of the *election of the Gentiles, as God's People*, from now on, instead of the Jews, who had enjoyed that prerogative hitherto; and asserts, that both Jews and Gentiles now constitute the Kingdom of God. In substituting the Christian People for the Jewish Nation, St. Paul maintains, God has done no injustice to the Jews, since the true Israel, or Christian People, is now constituted of Jews and Gentiles; "even as us (Christians), whom He hath called not of the Jews only, but of the Gentiles."

Jacob had been chosen Chief of God's People, from which

the Messiah was to come, according to the flesh. This preference extended but to this honor, *and no further*. It was a preference determined on, too, before either had been born, or could have done anything to deserve or forfeit it. It was solely of God's foreknowledge, or mercy, accordingly.

Yet God's pleasure was not wholly of an arbitrary nature, we may well think. His foreknowledge must have discerned those very elements of character, which would constitute a successful Chief. Surely, there could have been no desert in Jacob, or fault in Esau, since both were yet unborn, as we saw, when the election had already been determined on. The Messiah could not come of both. The favor and honor of being His ancestor was due to neither. Neither could with any fairness complain of injustice, no matter which might be chosen. God is ever conferring natural, mental, moral as well as temporal blessings on some, which He withholds from others. But, whilst they do cause unrest and jealousy, they do not affect our eternal lot; nor even produce a greater or lesser saintliness, of necessity. No one thinks St. Peter to have been a better man than St. John was, though a marked preference was assigned the former by our Lord. The same is to be said of Jacob and Esau, though more temporal favor had been given to Jacob, of God's wise pleasure, foreknowledge, or election, if we please.

St. Paul proceeds to tell, why the true Religion departed from the children of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, or Jewish Nation. They had hardened themselves, as Pharaoh had done to himself, for which God left them over, as God had left that King over, and suffered both to sink still further down into obduracy. If asked, Why? Then we have the oft and sadly misquoted phrase: "Hath not the potter power over the clay," &c.? The apostle means to say, that such a question no man has any right to address to God; as little as the clay might ask some such question of the potter. "The question involves an audacity," Munger tells us, "that almost forbids utterance." The Jews may continue to find fault with their



lot; but they cannot complain against God's Providence, through which their glory departed, since God had shown them much and long patience, and borne long with their hardness, ere He left them over in their obduracy. If then He would show His power and justice in another direction, by raising up another People, and leave Jacob's children in their hardness, no one dare say: "What doest thou?" The comparison drawn by the apostle, between the potter and the clay, and God and the Jews, *extends only over those who have already hardened themselves.* No such dare justly ask: "Why hast thou suffered this in me." It is not meant thereby to teach, that God is justified to do with men as He sees fit, even as the potter does to his clay! If that were meant, then, no Saint in Heaven could be thought secure in his beatitude.

It is written, that God raised up Pharaoh for a "purpose." "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee," &c. This is read so as to mean that God raised up Pharaoh *for the sole purpose of showing His power over him in his obduracy.* The sense is, that after Pharaoh's obduracy had set in, God showed His superior power and wisdom by grandly over-ruling even Pharaoh in his hardness. And this was wonderfully fulfilled, in all after ages, and is still being exhibited in our day, in the repetition of the Decalogue. How few think of the fact, that God's wisdom and power were so greatly enhanced, in consequence of that King's stubbornness, that both Egypt and Pharaoh's tyranny have become immortal through the Ten Commandments! Ever and ever is the phrase on the lips of young and old: "I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee *out of the Land of Egypt, out of the House of Bondage.*" Egypt has become the symbol of a fallen world; Egypt's thralldom, a type of Sin; and Egypt's Sovereign, a representative of the great adversary of souls. (Rev. ii. 8).

St. Paul's conclusion is to be read in the same spirit. "What if God, willing to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath?"



Are we to suppose this means to teach us, that God endured the vessels of wrath, *for the purpose of showing how great is His wrath?* Surely, the endurance of all this was an evidence of long-suffering and mercy, rather. The sense is this, much more: "What then? Who has any just ground for complaint, if God, after having endured the Jews so long as a chosen Nation, is now minded to show His wrath, by letting them severely alone, in their hardness?"

The entire section has no eye at all on *what is yet to be*; on *the salvation or condemnation of any People*, or of *any individual*; not even does it allude to *any future event*. It is no Prophecy, let it be remembered! It is, in one word, a recital of what must be regarded as *a consummated fact*: The Rejection of the Jewish Nation, as God's People, and the Substitution of the Christian Church, constituted of Jews and Gentiles.

St. Paul in his *Letter to the Galatians* teaches, besides, that the Jews had only designed to be the chosen Nation, *until the Messiah would come*. "The sceptre was then to depart from Judah" at all events. Independent of their judicial blindness, then, this high prerogative was to be no longer theirs. Thus an additional argument is given us, for the declaration, that they could not find fault with God's dealings since they had not received that Messiah, but had rejected Him. Still, if they were willing to stand aside of the Gentiles, they yet might share the glory of Christ's Kingdom; but if they were not willing to take such an honor, the sin lay at their own door. In every view, therefore, God is vindicated, and Jews may as little ask petulantly: "Why hast thou forsaken us?" as the clay of the potter may ask: "Why dost thou of the same lump allow some unto vessels of such honor, and some unto less honorable vessels?"

In Romans viii. (29-30) it is written: "For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them

He also called ; and whom He called, them He also justified ; and whom He justified, them He also glorified."

It is worthy of notice especially, that all that is here again written, is written of *what had already been consummated*. The "foreknowledge," the "predestination,"—the "calling," the "justification," and the "glorification," all these gracious acts of God are represented as *having already been done*, for Jews and Gentiles. All the "predestinating," on the part of God was, that Mankind should be conformed "to the image of His Son ;" or, be so conditioned, by the Plan of Redemption, that all men might be placed in a salvable state. Now "all things work together for good to them who love God ; to them who are called according to His purpose." And what is that Divine "purpose ?" The Salvation of the Human Race. The Plan of Redemption was the result of God's "foreknowing." And to this high end was His "predestinating." To this same end was the "calling," as well. The "justifying" and "glorifying" are conditioned by but one thing : that they "love God, or trust and obey Him." The promise is, not to *persons irrespective of character, spirit and conduct* ; but to *character solely*. "There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (let them be Jew or Gentile) ; "who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" of God's Plan. Love, Obedience, Holiness, are the necessary conditions, that such "predestinating," "calling," "justification" and "glorification" should fruit in their salvation. Whatever God had done for the Jews, aforetime, that He had now also done for the Gentiles, for Mankind ; in consequence of His wise "foreknowing" laying such a Universal Plan, through which He could "predestinate," "call" and "glorify."

But since the Jews, notwithstanding all this, had forfeited their high prerogatives and privileges, and instead of being "glorified," were degraded, because of their not appreciating their gracious election ; so, too, a similar fate awaits the Gentiles, if these sin after the manner of those. The lesson is for all men. In spite of all the rich provision already made on

the part of God, it is still in the power of man to refuse his assent and consent to God's "predetermination," "election," or Will. Else the pointed question in Hebrews (ii. 3) has no meaning: "How shall we escape, if we NEGLECT so great Salvation"? Eternal Beatification is not a matter of arbitrary conferring, by any means; but the result of men co-operating with God's Will. God is "the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe." (1. Tim. iv. 10). What is by Divine intention, becomes actual in those who love God.

After an impartial examination of the entire series of Scriptural phrases, which seem to conflict with the very soul-meaning of the term GOSPEL, we feel no little comfort in the conviction that "the Lord is good to ALL; and his tender mercies are OVER ALL HIS WORKS."

NOTE.—The author gladly acknowledges the aid he received from the pages of Clarke, Brownson and Munger; from whose writings sentences and paragraphs were freely drawn for the structure of his article.

## VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THE LOGIC OF INTROSPECTION ; OR METHOD IN MENTAL SCIENCE. By Rev. J. B. Wentworth, D.D., New York : Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranstons & Stowe. 1886.

We have thought for a long time that more is gained by setting about *doing* things than by discussing the *method* of doing them. In our teachers' institutes a great deal of time is taken up in discussing methods of teaching the A. B. C's, reading, arithmetic, etc., as if there were something magical in the way, or method, of teaching these subjects. We would not set aside the importance of right methods, but a teacher who really understands the subject he undertakes to teach, and has any talent for teaching, will find a method of communicating what he knows to the pupil. In some respects every teacher must be able to make his own method.

The same is true in regard to the text books on the sciences generally taught. If the writer understands his subject thoroughly he will be able to find a method of making it clear to others. A proper outline, or skeleton, is important, which ought to be logical, but the filling in, the details, etc., will be determined by each mind for itself, and the living teacher will not lay much stress on this, for he should be able to supply it for himself.

Here is a book of over 400 pages on Method in Mental Science, by which the writer seems to mean Psychology, though he spreads out his argument over nearly the whole field of Metaphysics. As the name of his book implies, he wishes to prove that Introspection is the only proper method of studying mental science. He calls this the *Consciential Method*. Over against this he combats the method of induction advocated by Bacon, which he says may do for the study of natural science, but cannot be applied to the study of mental science. The main portion of the work is a violent polemic against Dr. McCosh. A strong polemical attitude in any case is not just the best state of mind for investigation, and we think this writer loads Dr. McCosh with inferences that are not fairly deducible from his writings.

There is important truth in what he says in regard to introspection, looking in upon one's self and studying the data of consciousness. We agree with him that the *Baconian* method, when applied in a wrong way, has wrought great evil, and we as decidedly oppose

the tendency of the sensational philosophy of modern times. But we think he takes up too much space in trying to convict Dr. McCosh of favoring this tendency, and altogether too much in stating his theory. The truth is that intuition and induction can both be safely employed in mental science. If the writer had produced a psychology itself, it would be the best proof of the truth of his method. One does not care to wade through 400 pages to learn simply the method of writing a psychology.

RENT, WAGES AND CAPITAL. A Book for the Times. By Roger S. Welty. Laporte Printing Co., Printers. Laporte, Indiana. 1886. Price 60 cents.

This volume, a duodecimo of 115 pages, claims to be a book for the times, and such it really is. In a clear and vigorous manner it discusses some phases of the Land Question with special reference to Henry George's proposition to make land common property. With Mr. George the author takes direct issue. He holds that "it is a most dangerous doctrine that the material welfare of individuals and classes is to be secured by grasping from the hand of other individuals and classes their possessions," and that "to declare one man's gain to be another's loss is to remove all moral restraints." He also does not hesitate to say that, notwithstanding the distressing tale of the wrongs of the laboring classes with which the demagogue is abroad, "their condition has been greatly improved—that it is better to-day than in any previous age. And more—that it will continue to improve." This he considers the world's greatest age. "Our present greatness," moreover, he well observes, "has been evolved from past conditions; our further advance must be an evolution from the present. But this we must know—that there must be a forward movement all along the line—civilization gains a little here and a little there, some to-day and some to-morrow, and the sum of all these advances constitutes progress." We would commend the work to the attention of all who are interested in the question of which it treats. The author shows himself to be well acquainted with what has been written on the subject under consideration, and, moreover, to be a thinker and writer of more than ordinary ability.

THE TWO BOOKS OF NATURE AND REVELATION COLLATED. By George D. Armstrong, D.D., Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Norfolk, Va., and formerly Professor of Chemistry and Geology in Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va. Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 10 and 12 Dey Street: London, 44 Fleet Street. 1886. Price \$1.00.

The object of Dr. Armstrong in preparing this volume was not to work out a harmony of science and revelation. This, he correctly holds, is a work belonging to the future. His purpose, accordingly, is merely to collate the two books of nature and revelation; and this

with the design (1) of directing the reader's attention to the points in which the latest results of scientific investigation and the statements of revelation, put on record many centuries ago, are at one; and (2) to show that even on points in which at present there is apparent discrepancy, there is no necessary contradiction. The work is a small duodecimo of 212 pages, and is divided into six chapters whose titles are: Nature and Revelation; Primeval Man; Evolution; The Mosaic Cosmogony; The Pentateuch; and Providence and Prayer. The book throughout is well-written and contains some strong points. Dr. Armstrong is, however, very conservative. He rejects evolution in every form, and holds that "the higher criticism" is "a system of 'destructive criticism,' false in some of the most important and fundamental of its assumptions, partial and unfair in its application of sound criteria of judgment to questions concerning the authorship and credibility of the several parts of the Old Testament Scriptures, especially the Pentateuch, and unreliable in its methods, even where those methods are least open to objection."

THE JEWISH ALTAR: An Inquiry into the Spirit and Intent of the Expiatory Offerings of the Mosaic Ritual. With Special Reference to their Typical Character. By John Leighton, D.D. Funk & Wagnalls: New York; 10 and 12 Dey Street. London; 44 Fleet Street. 1886. Price 75 cents.

This little volume, as stated on the title page, is an inquiry into the spirit, and intent of the expiatory offerings of the Mosaic ritual. The conclusion to which this inquiry leads is that the main purpose of the ritual under consideration was not to predict Christ but to prepare the way for Him. "The Mosaic rites," the author maintains "were types of New Testament things in the sense that the two stood opposite to each other, each answering to each, in their respective spheres, and in their corresponding aims and ends—that is between them there was an analogy, a correspondence of relations or ratios." And just because this is the case he claims, and we think properly, that the laws and history of the Mosaic ritual of the Altar present most necessary data to guide the Christian Church in determining the New Testament doctrine of the Cross. Though we are not prepared to agree with Dr. Leighton on all points, yet we believe that the view for which he contends in the treatise before us, is the correct one and that the Old Testament studied in the light of it will be found to have new interest and value. The work is deserving of the attention and consideration of ministers of the Gospel generally and, indeed, of all persons who are interested in rightly understanding the word of God.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN: With an Historical and Critical Introduction. By F. Godet, Doctor in Theology and Professor in the Faculty of the Independent Church of Neuchâtel. Vol. II. Translated from the Third French Edition with a Preface, Introductory Suggestions, and Additional Notes by Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1886. Price \$3.00 per volume.

This volume completes Dr. Dwight's translation of this very valuable work. Besides the Commentary on Chapters 6-21 it contains the Preface to the Commentary to the third French Edition, a table of Contents of the Commentary, Additional Notes by the American Editor, and an index of matter. The Additional Notes which fill eighty-six pages of the present volume add very considerably to the value of this work. In its present form we consider this Commentary on John, the best in the English language. It should have a place in every minister's library.

ENGLISH HYMNS: Their Authors and History. By Samuel Willoughby Duffield, Author of "The Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns," "The Heavenly Land," "Warp and Woof: A Book of Verse," "The Burial of the Dead," etc., etc. Funk & Wagnalls. New York: 10 and 12 Dey Street: London, 44 Fleet Street. 1886. Price \$2.50.

Those who would acquaint themselves with the authorship and history of the English hymns, should by all means procure a copy of this book. In it over 1,500 hymns are annotated. Not only is the name of the author and a brief sketch of his life when known given, but also in so far as could be learned the time and circumstances which gave rise to the hymn. Facts pertaining to the history of the hymns and interesting and illustrating anecdotes concerning them are also in many cases given. The volume accordingly is not only very instructive, but also exceedingly entertaining. No other work in the English language, so far as we are aware, contains anything like the same amount of information about the various hymns used in worship by those speaking the English tongue. Ministers will find this work especially valuable. It will enable them to add interest to their week-day evening services, and furnish them in some cases with apt illustrations for their sermons.

THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION, THE FALL AND THE DELUGE. By J. B. Reimensnyder, D.D. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society.

The author of this volume selected a difficult subject, and yet he has treated it in such a way as to render it plain and edifying to the ordinary reader. There is no attempt to bring forward anything new, but rather a justification of the old, the writer holding fast to six literal days of twenty-four hours each, and maintaining that there is nothing in this interpretation that conflicts with the

teachings of science. There is running throughout the volume a rather sharp polemical spirit, in referring to science, and a disposition to summarily set aside the conclusions of science wherever these seem to antagonize the writer's interpretations. In some instances arguments are deduced from the account of the creation against certain theories of science which the inspired record hardly justifies. For instance, in quoting from Gen. v. 11, "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth: and it was so," the writer argues that because each of these was created *before its seed*, "the statement contains a refutation of any theory of vegetation having arisen from seminal principles or evolutionary developments, and shows that it originated alone from a First Great Cause. And from this we also learn that no slow growth from seed gradually appeared, but that everything sprang into existence at full maturity."

This, we think, is claiming quite too much from the text. When God said, "Let the earth *bring forth* grass, the herb, &c.," it does not say how this bringing forth took place,—whether by the implantation of life-germs in the earth, or by the creation of fully-developed vegetation. It seems to us rather to favor the former, but no argument can be drawn from the expression against either form. And in the same way a good deal of the author's denunciation of scientists and their theories amounts to little more than mere assertion. The book contains some useful practical lessons and inferences, and may afford some benefit to the common reader, but it adds nothing to the theological treatment of the subjects considered.



